START

KARNATAKA
STATE
ARCHIVES

ARS 46 NAI 2006

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಗದ್ಗುರು ತೋಂಟದಾರ್ಯಮಠದ
ಪ್ರಾಚೀನ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳು - ಗದಗ

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರ
ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಪತ್ರಾಗಾರ ನಿರ್ದೇಶನಾಲಯ
ದೂರವಾಣಿ ಸಂ: 22254465

ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ. ಉಷಾಸುರೇಶ್
ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕರು
ರಾಜ್ಯ ಪತ್ರಾಗಾರ ನಿರ್ದೇಶನಾಲಯ, ನೆಲ ಮಹಡಿ, ಕೊಠಡಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 9, ವಿಧಾನ ಸೌಧ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-1.

.ಸಂ: ಎಆರ್‌ಎಸ್ 46 ಎನ್‌ಎಐ 2006

ದಿನಾಂಕ: 10.1.2008.

Letter of Authenticity
ಅಧಿಕೃತ ಪತ್ರ

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಗದ್ಗುರು ತೋಂಟದಾರ್ಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನ ಮಠದಲ್ಲಿರುವ 1660 ರಿಂದ 18ನೇ ಶತಮಾನದವರೆಗಿನ ಅನೇಕ ಅತ್ಯಮೂಲ್ಯ ಪ್ರಾಚೀನ ಕಾಗದ ಪತ್ರಗಳು ಶ್ರೀ ಮಠದ ಹಸ್ತಪ್ರತಿ ಭಂಡಾರದಲ್ಲಿವೆ. ಅವು ಕೆಳದಿ ಅರಸರು, ದೇಸಾಯಿಗಳು, ಗೌಡರು, ಕುಲಕರ್ಣಿಯವರು, ಶಾನುಭೋಗರು, ಶ್ರೀಮಠದ ಶ್ರೀಮಂತ ಭಕ್ತರು, ಹಣದಾನ, ಭೂದಾನ, ಆಹಾರದಾನ, ಮುಂತಾದ ರೀತಿಯ ಭಕ್ತಿ ಕಾಣಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಬಿನ್ನವತ್ತಳೆ, ದಾನ ಶಾಸನ, ನಿರೂಪ, ಕೌಲುಪತ್ರ, ಕರಾರು ಪತ್ರ, ಖರೀದಿ ಪತ್ರ, ಭೋಗ್ಯಾದಿ ಪತ್ರ, ಅದೇಶಿಕ ಪತ್ರ, ಆಶೀರ್ವಾದ ಪತ್ರ, ಬಿನ್ನಹಪತ್ರ, ಮುಂತಾದ ದಾಖಲೆ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟವುಗಳಾಗಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಐತಿಹಾಸಿಕ ದಾಖಲೆ ಸಮೇತ ನೀಡಿದ ಪತ್ರಗಳು ಸುಮಾರು 2500ಕ್ಕೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಇವೆ. ಮುಂದಿನ ಜನಾಂಗಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಗೂ ಸಂಶೋಧಕರಿಗೆ ಉಪಯೋಗವಾಗುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ಅಮೂಲ್ಯ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂರಕ್ಷಿಸಲು, ಸೂಕ್ಷ್ಮ ಚಿತ್ರೀಕರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ದೃಢೀಕರಿಸಿದೆ.

ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕರು.
ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಪತ್ರಾಗಾರ ಇಲಾಖೆ.

10/1/08

S.No	Subject of the letter	pg	year
1	Judgment in special Appeal No - 277	04	1875
2	Memorandom To Mr. Channabasavayya Hangarimath and other resident of Mundargi	02	1913
3	ದಿವಾಣಿ ಮೊಕ್ಕದ್ದಮೆ ನಂಬರು – 277	17	1914
4	Order passed by E. Maconochie the District Magistrate	05	1913
5	Petition against Shree Jagadguru Annadanaswami Mundargi File of 45 pages	45	1940
6	Answer to notice	02	
7	Cross palanquin ceremony of annadanaswami of Mundargi	03	1940
8	Petition	05	1940
9	For claim No 360 of 1867	08	1868
10	Argument	06	1913
11	Application under section 144 Cr Pc	02	
12	Copy applied for on 23-11-20	04	1920
13	ಕೋರ್ಟ ಪತ್ರ ನಂಬರ 533	02	1910
14	ಶಿರೋಳ ಖಪ್ಲೇದ ಸಂಬಂಧಿ ಕೋರ್ಟ ಪತ್ರ	02	1933
15	Stamp paper of Hampasagar village field in Huvina Hadagali	02	1949
16	Copy applied for on 25th Feb 1927 No 139	04	1916
17	Copy applied for on 25th Feb 1927 No 138	04	1916
18	Copy applied for on 25th Feb 1927 No 277/14	04	1916
19	Copy applied for on 25th Feb 1927 No 139	04	1916
20	Copy applied for on 25th Feb 1927 No 138	04	1916
21	ಉತ್ಸವ ಕುರಿತು ಪತ್ರಗಳ ಫೈಲು	25	1914
22	ತೀರ್ಪಿನ ಕನ್ನಡ ಬಾಷಾಂತರ	01	1882
23	A request letter to the Karbhari, Ramdurg	02	1918
24	ಮುಂಡರಗಿ ಅನ್ನದಾನ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳ ಜವಾಬು	01	1954
25	ಧಾರವಾಡ ಸಬ್‌ಜಜ್‌ಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ಸರ್ಟಿಫಿಕೇಟ	02	1906
26	File No.P.O.L.S.R. 771	65	1941
27	Copy of order by the mamledar of Navalgund R.T.A. No 147/1950	05	1950
28	ನವಲಗುಂದ ಭೂ ನ್ಯಾಯಮಂಡಳಿ ತೀರ್ಪು – LRA 57:89	13	1989
29	ಅಸಿಸ್ಟಂಟ್ ಕಮಿಶನರ್ ಗದಗ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಬರಕೊಂಡ ಅರ್ಜಿ	01	1964
30	ಸಿದ್ಧಯ್ಯ ಬಸಯ್ಯ ಹಿರೆಮಠ ಸಾ॥ ಚಿಂಚಲಿ ಇವರು ಬರಕೊಂಡ ಅರ್ಜಿ	02	
31	ಪೋಲಿಸ್ ಸಬ್ ಇನಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಮುಂಡರಗಿ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಬರಕೊಂಡ ಯಾದಿ	01	1964
32	Court order cax no 653	06	1904
33	Judgment copy applied for on 7th Jan 1937	04	1943
34	ಬೈಲು ಜಾಗೇದ ಅಗಾವ ಭಾಡೆ ಪತ್ರ	06	1945
35	Refund of estate duty paid claim for interest	04	1980
36	ಧಾರವಾಡ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಜಡ್ಜ್ ಅಪಿಲಿನ ತೀರ್ಪು	06	1904
37	Petition in the court of Hospet Bellary Dist.	01	1904
38	ಮೊಕ್ತಿಯಾರ್ ಪತ್ರ	09	1913
39	ರೋಣ ಮಾಮಲೇದಾರರ ಹುಕುಂ	01	1913
40	Translation of Second appeal 822 of 1917	04	1919

41	ಮೊಕ್ತಿಯಾರ್ ಪತ್ರ		
42	Petition in the court of Hospet Bellary Dist. 08/1904	01	1904
43	Petition	05	1957
44	Appeal to the Divisional commissioner Gulbarga	02	1957
45	Inam Enquiry Inamdar of Kukanoor and Sanganhal	01	1311 F
46	Tahsil office Yelburga (Copy in Urdu)	06	
47	Order passed by the District Magistrate Dharwar	05	1913
48	ಜನರಲ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ನಂ 238 ಹುಕುಂ	01	1914
49	ಮೊಕ್ತಿಯಾರ್ ಪತ್ರ	04	1912
50	Grant of NA permission Dambal village	01	1955
51	Proceedings of the District Magistrate of Bellary	03	1903
52	Order of the petition no P/415 of 1910	01	1912
53	Memorandum to C.M. Hungrimath & others of Mundargi	02	1914
54	Copy of order no 8230 dated 26th Dec 1906	06	1909
55	Affidavit Mismanagement of Math at Rajur & others (Urdu)	09	1957
56	An appeal to the collection & Dist Magistrate	01	1943
57	Order under section 124 Cr.Pc	02	1902
58	A request letter to the commissioner of Income Tax in Mysore	01	1971
59	In the court of Income Tax offer in Mysore	01	1971
60	In the High court of Mysore at Bangalore	02	
61	Claim under section 9(3) & 10 of the Land Acquisition Act 1	01	
62	Cross palanquin ceremony of Annadanaswami of Mundargi	04	1940
63	Memorandum C.F. Hungrimath & others of Mundargi	01	1914
64	Order on the petition no P/415 of 1910	02	1912
65	O.S/ 277/14 ನಿಶಾನಿ ನಂಬರು 147	03	1927
66	O.S/277/14 " "	03	1927
67	O.S/277/14 " " 140	05	1927
68	O.S/277/14 " " 143	03	1927
69	ಮೊಕ್ತಿಯಾರ್ ಪತ್ರ	05	1860
70	Memoandum No 8387 of 1912	01	1912
71	Argument on cross palanquin	06	1921
72	Memorandum C.F. Hangrimath 7 others	01	1914
73	ಗದಗ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿ ದವಾಖಾನೆಗೆ ಬಿ.ಡಿ. ಕಬಾಡಿ ಹೆಸರು ಹಾಕುವುದನ್ನು ತಡೆಯಲು ಅರ್ಜಿ	02	1950
74	In the court of the subordinate judge, Bellary	01	1950
75	ಮೊಕ್ತಿಯಾರ್ ಪತ್ರ	14	1889
76	Judgment copy - claim Rs 600/-	06	1931
77	ದಿವಾಣಿ ದಾವೇದಾರ್ ಪತ್ರ	16	1881
78	Judgment in Appeal No 07 of 1883	02	1884
79	Collecting the debts due to the matt No 49 of 1931-32	02	1933
80	Appeal No 15 of 1898	06	1898
81	Appeal No 152 of 1891 claim Rs 5475 -0-0	02	1891
82	Judgment in appeal no 7 of 1883	04	1892
83	ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟ ಆಫ್ ಜಸ್ಟೀಸ್ ಬಾಂಬೆ – ತೀರ್ಪು	05	1891
84	Land acquisition Act made by the special deputy collector No. V	07	1950

S.No	Subject of the letter	pg	year
1	Judgment in special Appeal No - 277	04	1875
2	Memorandom To Mr. Channabasavayya Hangarimath and other resident of Mundargi	02	1913
3	ದಿವಾಣಿ ಮೊಕ್ಕದ್ದಮೆ ನಂಬರು – 277	17	1914
4	Order passed by E. Maconochic the District Magistrate	05	1913
5	Petition against Shree Jagadguru Annadanaswami Mundargi File of 45 pages	45	1940
6	Answer to notice	02	
7	Cross palanquin ceremony of annadanaswami of Mundargi	03	1940
8	Petition	05	1940
9	For claim No 360 of 1867	08	1868
10	Argument	06	1913
11	Application under section 144 Cr Pc	02	
12	Copy applied for on 23-11-20	04	1920
13	ಕೋರ್ಟ ಪತ್ರ ನಂಬರ 533	02	1910
14	ತಿರೋಳ ಖಪ್ಲೇದ ಸಂಬಂಧಿ ಕೋರ್ಟ ಪತ್ರ	02	1933
15	Stamp paper of Hampasagar village field in Huvina Hadagali	02	1949
16	Copy applied for on 25th Feb 1927 No 139	04	1916
17	Copy applied for on 25th Feb 1927 No 138	04	1916
18	Copy applied for on 25th Feb 1927 No 277/14	04	1916
19	Copy applied for on 25th Feb 1927 No 139	04	1916
20	Copy applied for on 25th Feb 1927 No 138	04	1916
21	ಉತ್ಸವ ಕುರಿತು ಪತ್ರಗಳ ಫೈಲು	25	1914
22	ತೀರ್ಪಿನ ಕನ್ನಡ ಬಾಷಾಂತರ	01	1882
23	A request letter to the Karbhari, Ramdurg	02	1918
24	ಮುಂಡರಗಿ ಅನ್ನದಾನ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳ ಜವಾಬು	01	1954
25	ಧಾರವಾಡ ಸಬ್‌ಜಜ್‌ಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ಸರ್ಟಿಫಿಕೇಟ	02	1906
26	File No.P.O.L.S.R. 771	65	1941
27	Copy of order by the mamledar of Navalgund R.T.A. No 147/1950	05	1950
28	ನವಲಗುಂದ ಭೂ ನ್ಯಾಯಮಂಡಳಿ ತೀರ್ಪು – LRA 57:89	13	1989
29	ಅಸಿಸ್ಟಂಟ್ ಕಮಿಶನರ್ ಗದಗ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಬರಕೊಂಡ ಅರ್ಜಿ	01	1964
30	ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಬಸಯ್ಯ ಹಿರೆಮಠ ಸಾ॥ ಚಿಂಚಲಿ ಇವರು ಬರಕೊಂಡ ಅರ್ಜಿ	02	
31	ಪೋಲಿಸ್ ಸಬ್ ಇನಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಮುಂಡರಗಿ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಬರಕೊಂಡ ಯಾದಿ	01	1964
32	Court order cax no 653	06	1904
33	Judgment copy applied for on 7th Jan 1937	04	1943
34	ಬೈಲು ಜಾಗೇದ ಅಗಾವ ಭಾಡೆ ಪತ್ರ	06	1945
35	Refund of estate duty paid claim for interest	04	1980
36	ಧಾರವಾಡ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಜಡ್ಜ್ ಅಪಿಲಿನ ತೀರ್ಪು	06	1904
37	Petition in the court of Hospet Bellary Dist.	01	1904
38	ಮೊಕ್ತಿಯಾರ್ ಪತ್ರ	09	1913
39	ರೋಣ ಮಾಮಲೇದಾರರ ಹುಕುಂ	01	1913
40	Translation of Second appeal 822 of 1917	04	1919

41	ಮೊಕ್ತಿಯಾರ್ ಪತ್ರ		
42	Petition in the court of Hospet Bellary Dist. 08/1904	01	1904
43	Petition	05	1957
44	Appeal to the Divisional commissioner Gulbarga	02	1957
45	Inam Enquiry Inamdar of Kukanoor and Sanganhal	01	1311 F
46	Tahsil office Yelburga (Copy in Urdu)	08	
47	Order passed by the District Magistrate Dharwar	05	1913
48	ಜನರಲ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ನಂ 238 ಹುಕುಂ	01	1914
49	ಮೊಕ್ತಿಯಾರ್ ಪತ್ರ	04	1912
50	Grant of NA permission Dambal village	01	1955
51	Proceedings of the District Magistrate of Bellary	03	1903
52	Order of the petition no P/415 of 1910	01	1912
53	Memorandum to C.M. Hungrimath & others of Mundargi	02	1914
54	Copy of order no 8230 dated 26th Dec 1906	06	1909
55	Affidavit Mismanagement of Math at Rajur & others (Urdu)	09	1957
56	An appeal to the collection & Dist Magistrate	01	1943
57	Order under section 124 Cr.Pc	02	1902
58	A request letter to the commissioner of Income Tax in Mysore	01	1971
59	In the court of Income Tax offer in Mysore	01	1971
60	In the High court of Mysore at Bangalore	02	
61	Claim under section 9(3) & 10 of the Land Acquisition Act 1	01	
62	Cross palanquin ceremony of Annadanaswami of Mundargi	04	1940
63	Memorandum C.F. Hungrimath & others of Mundargi	01	1914
64	Order on the petition no P/415 of 1910	02	1912
65	O.S/ 277/14 ನಿಶಾನಿ ನಂಬರು 147	03	1927
66	O.S/277/14 " "	03	1927
67	O.S/277/14 " " 140	05	1927
68	O.S/277/14 " " 143	03	1927
69	ಮೊಕ್ತಿಯಾರ್ ಪತ್ರ	05	1860
70	Memoandum No 8387 of 1912	01	1912
71	Argument on cross palanquin	06	1921
72	Memorandum C.F. Hangrimath 7 others	01	1914
73	ಗದಗ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿ ದವಾಖಾನೆಗೆ ಜಿ.ಟಿ. ಕಬಾಡಿ ಹೆಸರು ಹಾಕುವುದನ್ನು ತಡೆಯಲು ಅರ್ಜಿ	02	1950
74	In the court of the subordinate judge, Bellary	01	1950
75	ಮೊಕ್ತಿಯಾರ್ ಪತ್ರ	14	1889
76	Judgment copy - claim Rs 600/-	06	1931
77	ದಿವಾಣಿ ದಾವೇದಾರ್ ಪತ್ರ	16	1881
78	Judgment in Appeal No 07 of 1883	02	1884
79	Collecting the debts due to the matt No 49 of 1931-32	02	1933
80	Appeal No 15 of 1898	06	1898
81	Appeal No 152 of 1891 claim Rs 5475 -0-0	02	1891
82	Judgment in appeal no 7 of 1883	04	1892
83	ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಜಸ್ಟೀಸ್ ಬಾಂಬೆ – ತೀರ್ಪು	05	1891
84	Land acquisition Act made by the special deputy collector No. V	07	1950

	Tungabhadra project O.P.No 139 of 1950		
85	Deposition of deft,s Mukhtyar	01	
86	ಧಾರವಾಡ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ಮೊಕ್ಕದ್ದಮೆ ನಂಬರ್ 562 ಸಂ 1860	12	1867
87	ಸ್ಪೆಶಿಯಲ್ ಅಫೀಲ್ ನಂಬರ್ 722/1875	02	1880
88	ಕೋರ್ಟ ದಾವೆ 241/1932	17	1932
89	Petition Spl off Tungabhadra project	04	1949
90	ಮೊಕ್ತಿಯಾರ್ ನಾಮೆ ಪತ್ರ	02	1931
91	ತಕರಾರು ಪತ್ರ	04	1932
92	ಮೊಕ್ತಿಯಾರ್ ಪತ್ರ	05	1913
93	Order passed by E. Maconochie	05	1913
94	Order passed in the cross palanquin and panch kalasa case of Annadanaswami of Mundargi	05	1913
95	Proceedings of the magistrate of Hospet	03	1903
96	Memorandum no 8811 to C.F Hungrimath	03	1913
97	Order on the petition no P/415 of 1910	02	1912
98	Order on the petition no P/415 of 1910	02	1912
99	Appeal no 15 of 1898 from original decree	07	1898
100	ಕುಶಲೋಪರಿ ಪತ್ರ	01	
101	This Excellency the Excellency the Governor in council		
102	ಯಳಂದೂರ ಚೌಕಿಮರದ ಬಸಲಿಂಗಯ್ಯನವರು ಶ್ರೀಗಳವರಿಗೆ ಕುಶಲೋಪರಿ ಕೇಳಿ ಪತ್ರ		1812
103	Appeal no 822 of 1917 in the District court of Dharwar Civil appeal No 53		1916
104	ಭೂಮಿಯ ಕುರಿತ ಪತ್ರ		1875
105	ಸೊಸಲೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಿ ಪ್ರಸನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ ಲಿಮಿಟೆಡ್ ಆಫಿಸಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		1893
106	ರಾಚೋಟಿ ಮರಿ ಸಾ॥ ಗದಗ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ರಸಿದಿ (ಹಣದ್ದು)		1896
107	ಶ್ರೀ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀ ಪ್ರಸನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ ಲಿಮಿಟೆಡ್ ಆಫಿಸ ಸೊಸಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಭೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಯಾದಿ	15	1890
108	ಶ್ರೀಮದನಾದಿ ತೋಂಟದ ಸಿದ್ಧಲಿಂಗಾರ್ಯ ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧ (ಪ್ರೋಗ್ರಾಮ ಪತ್ರಿಕಾ)		1917
109	ಮೊಕ್ತಿಯಾರ ನಾಮಾ		19 ನೇ.ಶ
110	ಸೂಟ್ ಪಟ್ಟಿ		18 ನೇ.ಶ
111	ಆಯವ್ಯಯ ಬಾಂಡ ಪತ್ರ		18 ನೇ.ಶ
112	ಚಂದ್ರಶೇಖರ ಮರಿದೇವರಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ (ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಭೂಮಿದಾನದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ)		19 ನೇ
113	ನಾಗಾಪುರದಿಂದ ಬಂದ ಪತ್ರ		1930
114	ಕೆಳದಿ ಶಾಸನ (ಜಿಂನಹ ಪತ್ರ)		1675
115	ಕೆಳದಿ ಶಾಸನ (ಜಿಂನಹ ಪತ್ರ)		1675
116	ಮೋಡಿ ಪತ್ರ ದಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದು		18 ನೇ.ಶ
117	ಕೆಳದಿ (ದಾನಪತ್ರ)		16 ನೇ.ಶ
118	ಕೆಳದಿ ನಿರೂಪ		16 ನೇ.ಶ
119	ಕೆಳದಿ ಮೂಲಿವೀಸ		16 ನೇ.ಶ
120	ಫೀ ತಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರಿ ರಸೀದಿ		1912
121	ಪಿಟಿಷನ್ (ಬಾಂಬೆ ಸರಕಾರ)		1890
122	ಖಟ್ಲೇರ ಪತ್ರ (ರಾಚೋಟಿಮಠ)		1890
123	ಹಣ ವಾಪಸಿನ ರಸೀದಿ		1873
124	" "		1883
125	ಜಮೀನು ದಾಖಲೆ ಪತ್ರ (ಪಾವತಿ ನಂ 26)		1884
126	ತೂಕ ಅಳತೆ ಚೀಟಿ		1888

127	ದಾವೆ ಪತ್ರ (ಗ್ರಾಮದವರಿಂದ)		1887
128	1886 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ 2ನೇ ನಂಬರು ಆಕ್ಟಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇನ್‌ಕಮಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ (ಹಾಳೆಹರಿದಿದೆ)		1886
129	ಸನದಪತ್ರ (ಗ್ರಾಮದವರಿಂದ)		1887
130	ಮುಂಡರಗಿಯಿಂದ ಬಂದ ಪತ್ರ (ವಹಿವಾಟು ಕುರಿತು)		1887
131	ಪ್ಲಾಟ ನಕಾಶೆ		-
132	ಆಲೂರ ಪತ್ರ		1890
133	ಮಠದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಿಯಾದ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ ಮಠಹಾಳು ಮಾಡುವರಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		-
134	ಖರೀದಿ ರಶೀದಿ		-
135	ಹಪರುದ ಸಮಸ್ತ ದೈವದವರು ಗಣಾಧನೆಗೆ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		1830
136	ಕರಾರ ಪತ್ರ (ಭೂಮಿ)		1870
137	ಭೂಮಿಗಾಗಿ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		1840
138	ಕರಿಬಸವಮರಿ ತೋಂಟದಾರ್ಯ ಮಠದಿಂದ ಸಬ್‌ರಜಿಸ್ಟರಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	2	18 ನೇ.ಶ
139	ಅರ್ಜಿ ಪತ್ರ (ಶ್ರೀ ಮಠದಿಂದ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ)		1840
140	ಕರಾರು ಪತ್ರ (ಭೂಮಿಯದ್ದು)		1887
141	ಅರ್ಜಿ (ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ)		1840
142	ಮೊಖ್ತಿಯಾರ ಪತ್ರ		1840
143	ಭೂಮಿ ಮಠಕೆ ಗುಂಟೆಗಳ ಪತ್ರ		1840
144	ಯಾತ್ರಾ ಮಹೋತ್ಸವದ ಟೈಮ ಟೇಬಲ್ (ಕವರಿನಲ್ಲಿ)		1954
145	ಮೃತ್ಯು ಪತ್ರ		1959
146	Judgement in special Appeal No 277 of	4	1875
147	Appeal against the order of the divisional Commissioner	8	1957
148	ಮುಂಡರಗಿ ಮಠದ ನ್ಯಾಯದ್ದು (ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ)	14	1928
149	Judicial Department ಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		1913
150	Appeal No 119	42	1936
151	Memorandum to Dharwad magistrate		1913
152	ಧಾರವಾಡ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಅಕೌಂಟಿಂಗ್ ಮಾಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಟ್‌ರವರ (ಹಿಂದಿ)		1884
153	--		
154	LEX No 1914 Judge ದಿಂದ ಬಂದ ಪತ್ರ		1842
155	ಧಾರವಾಡ ಡಿ.ಸಿ. ಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ (ಭೂಮಿಯ ಕುರಿತು) ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷ		1842
156	ಜಾಹೀರ ನೋಟಿಸ		1922
157	Memorandum to Judicial Department		1905
158	---		1905
159	ಖರೀದಿ ಬಗ್ಗೆ – ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷ ಪತ್ರ		
160	Order on the petition		1910
161	ಯಾದಿ ಪತ್ರ (ಅನ್ನದಾನಿ ಮರಿದೇವರು ಬರೆದುಕೊಂಡ ಯಾದಿ)		1917
162	Dist magistrate Dharwad		1910
163	ವಾದಿ ಪತ್ರ (ಆರ್ಗ್ಯೂಮೆಂಟ್)	2	1940
164	ಜಮೀನ ಪತ್ರ ()		-
165	ರಾಜೂರ ಹೊಲದ ಕುರಿತು ತಹಶಿಲ್ದಾರಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		1957
166	Hydrabad Endoment appeal No of 57	8	1910
167	ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	6	1957
168	ಭೂಮಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಅರ್ಜಿ		
169	ನೋಟಿಸ್		1960
170	ಆಡಳಿತ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸುವ ಕುರಿತ ಪತ್ರ		1959
171	ಸರಕಾರಗ ಹುಕುಂ ಪತ್ರ	2	1937

172	ಯಿನಾಮು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಗಾಗಿ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ (ಪಸಲಿ ಕ್ಯಾಲೆಂಡರ)		1937
173	Confirmation of the chelogi of Totada Swami	4	1336
174	Dist Magistrate Bellari	16	
175	His Excellency the Governor in council Bombay	3	1929
176	” ” Bombay Govt		1929
177	ರೋಣ ತಾಲೂಕ ಕಛೇರಿಯಿಂದ ಶ್ರೀಗಳಿಗೆ (ನೀರಿನ ಪತ್ರ)		1910
178	" "		1910
179	" "		1910
180	ಯಾದಿ ಪತ್ರ (ಭೂಮಿ ಪತ್ರ)		1912
181	ಧಾರವಾಡ ಕೋರ್ಟದಿಂದ ಬಂದ ಪತ್ರ		1903
182	ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರೀಕ್ಟ ಮ್ಯಾಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಟಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		1903
183	ವುತಾರ ಪತ್ರ ತಗೆದ ದಿನ 1910		1910
184	ಕಲೆಕ್ಟರಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	4	1920
185	ಧಾರವಾಡ ಕಲೆಕ್ಟರಗೆ (ಮುದ್ದತಗಾಗಿ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ)		1920
186	ನೋಟಿಸ ಕಂಪೌಂಡ ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಿದ್ದರ ಕುರಿತು		1920
187	His excellency the governor of the bombay	2	1911
188	ಬೆಳಗಾಂ ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ರಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		1911
189	Southern Division ದಿಂದ ಶ್ರೀಮಠಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದ ಪತ್ರ		1924
190	ಲಿಂಗಾಯತ ಮಠದ ಭೂಮಿಗಳ ಕುರಿತು ಬೆಳಗಾಂವ ಕಲೆಕ್ಟರದಿಂದ ಬಂದ ಪತ್ರ	2	1911
191	ಪ್ರತಿಯಾಗಿ ವಾದ (ದಾವೆ) ಪಿಟಿಷನ್		1910
192	Memorandum (Political Department)		1911
193	ಮೊಖ್ತಿಯಾರದ ವುತಾರ ತಗೆಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಅದರ ಖರ್ಚು ಕುರಿತು ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		1910
194	" "		1910
195	ಆಯವ್ಯಯ ಪತ್ರ		1904
196	ಭೂಮಿ ಕುರಿತ	4	1904
197	Endoment		1904
198	ಮೋಜಣಿ ಪತ್ರ	6	1906
199	" '		1906
200	ನೋಟಿಸ ಪತ್ರ (ಸರಕಾರದಿಂದ)		1904
201	ಮೃತಳಾದ ನೀಲವ್ವಾಳ ಜಾತಿ ಖೊಟ್ಟಿಯಿದ್ದರ ಕುರಿತು ಪತ್ರ		1919
202	ಮೋಖ್ತಿಯಾರ ಪತ್ರ (ಆರ್ಡರ್)		1940
203	" " (ತುಂಬಾ ಹರಿದಿದೆ)	4	1940
204	Application under section 144 criminal procedure code	15	-
205.	Order passed Dist magistrate Dharwad	10	1940
206	Against in the dist court of Dharwad	18	1940
207	Informed to Shrimath (144 act)		1940
208	The collector of Bellary	8	
209	The dist magistrate Dharwar	8	1906
210	ಮೊಕ್ಯಾರ ವುತಾರ	8	1903
211	Read the police inspector Gada circle vernacular Act 427	4	1912
212	The dist magistate (Dharwar)	20	1940
213	ಖರೀದಿ ಪತ್ರ (ಹೊಲದ)		18 ನೇ.ಶ
214	ಖರೀದಿ ಪತ್ರ		18 ನೇ.ಶ
215	ಖರೀದಿ ಪತ್ರ (ಯಿಂಗಳಕ್ಕಿ ಕಟಿ ಹೊಲದ್ದು)		18 ನೇ.ಶ
216	ಗಂಗವ್ವ ಕೊಂ ಚನಬಸವ್ವ ಚಿತ್ತವಾಡಗಿ ಇವರದು ಖರೀದಿ ಪತ್ರ		18 ನೇ.ಶ

217	ಖರೀದಿ ಪತ್ರ (ಯಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ ಬಿನ್ ಅಯ್ಯಪ್ಪನ)		18 ನೇ.ಶ
218	ಖರೀದಿ ಪತ್ರ (ಹೊಲದ)		18 ನೇ.ಶ
219	ಖರೀದಿ ಪತ್ರ (ಹೊಲದ)		18 ನೇ.ಶ
220	ಖರೀದಿ ಪತ್ರ		
221	ಖರೀದಿ ಪತ್ರ		18 ನೇ.ಶ
222	ಖರೀದಿ ಪತ್ರ		
223	ಖರೀದಿ ಪತ್ರ		
224	ಖರೀದಿ ಪತ್ರ		
225	ಖರೀದಿ ಪತ್ರ		
226	ಖರೀದಿ ಪತ್ರ		
227	ಖರೀದಿ ಪತ್ರ		
228	ಖರೀದಿ ಪತ್ರ		
229	ಖರೀದಿ ಪತ್ರ ಟ್ರಝುರಿ ಆಫಿಸರ್		
230	ಟಪಾಲ	8	
231	ಭಾಡಿ ಪತ್ರ		
232	ಭಾಡಿ ಪತ್ರ		
233	ಕರಾರ ಪತ್ರ	4	
234	ಭಾಡಿ ಪತ್ರ		
235	ಕರಾರ ಪತ್ರ	4	
236	ಭಾಡಿ ಪತ್ರ		
237	ಕರಾರ ಪತ್ರ	4	1910
238	ಕರಾರ ಪತ್ರ	4	1926
239	ಕರಾರ ಪತ್ರ	4	1924
240	ಶಾಖಾಮರದ ಜಮೀನು ಕಾಗದ ಪತ್ರ	4	
241	ಕರಾರ ಪತ್ರ	4	1924
242	ಕರಾರ ಪತ್ರ	4	1934
243	ಕರಾರ ಪತ್ರ	4	1934
244	ಕರಾರ ಪತ್ರ	4	
245	ಕರಾರ ಪತ್ರ	4	1956
246	ಕರಾರ ಪತ್ರ	4	1956
247	ಕರಾರ ಪತ್ರ	4	1956
248	ಕರಾರ ಪತ್ರ	4	1956
249	ಭೂಮಿ ಇನಾಂ (ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರಗಳ ವಾಂಋಜ)	34	
250	The Gadag Mahalaxmi LTD	20	1981
251	The new Karnataka printing & published house		1992
252	ಮೈಸೂರು ಸ್ಟಾಕ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯ ಕಟಿಂಗ ಅಂಗಾಯತ	4	1910
253	“ ”		1910
254	ಸೋತ್ರ ಪತ್ರ (ಸಿದ್ಧಲಿಂಗೇಶ್ವರ)		18 ನೇ.ಶ
255	ವಾದಿ ಪತ್ರ		18 ನೇ.ಶ
256	ಹಿರೇಸಾವಿನ ಪತ್ರ		18 ನೇ.ಶ
257	ಕಛೇರಿ ಬಾಂಡ		1939 ನೇ
258	Padaytra of swamiji moorasaviramath hubli		1978
259	ಆಯವ್ಯಯ ಪತ್ರ		1957
260	Arms licence No – 986-5-20 For		1942

261	“ “		1942
262	ಮತೀಯ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯ ಮಸೂದೆ 1978	10	
263	ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರನಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತಾರ (ಲಾಯಿಸನ್ಸ ಕುರಿತು)		1941
264	ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಪೋಲಿಸ ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ರಿಗೆ ಲೈಸನ್ಸ್ ಕುರಿತು ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		1941
265	“ “		1941
266	ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ್ ಕುರಿತು (ಬಂದೂಕು)	3	1944
267	ರಸೀದಿಗಳು Akanoladgement	20	
268	Received register		
269	ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಶ್ಲೋಕದ ಪುಸ್ತಕ	40	
270	ಬಾಡಗಿ ಪತ್ರ		
271	ಪತ್ರ		
272	ಖಾತೆ ಪತ್ರ		
273	ಕ್ಯಾರೆಕ್ಟರ ಸರ್ಟಿಫಿಕೇಟ್		
274	ಪತ್ರ (ಶ್ರೀಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದು)		1936
275	ಪಾವತಿ (ಹಣದ್ದು)		1936
276	ಪತ್ರ ಕುಶಲೋಪರಿ		18 ನೇ.ಶ
277	ಮೋಖ್ತಿಯಾರ ಪತ್ರ ಕೊಪ್ಪಳ ತಾಲೂಕ ಕಛೇರಿಗೆ		18 ನೇ.ಶ
278	ಚರಮೂರ್ತಿಗಳು ಬರೆದುಕೊಟ್ಟ ಕರಾರು ಪತ್ರಗಳು	04	
279	ಕರಾರು ಪತ್ರ	04	1927
280	ಕರಾರು ಪತ್ರ (ಚರಮೂರ್ತಿಗಳಿಂದ)	04	
281	ಬಂದೂಕು ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ ಕುರಿತು ಪತ್ರ	04	
282	Speech by Shri S.K. Somani	04	1978
283	How to create healthy earth	02	
284	Health instruction for pationents	02	
285	“ “		
286	ವಾದಿ ಪತ್ರ		
287	ಆರ್ಯ ಮೇಶ್ಯ ಸಂಘ ರಾಮನಗರ (500 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಸಾಂಕ್ಷನ್ ಆದದ್ದರ ಕುರಿತು)	03	1978
288	ಯಾದಿ ಪತ್ರ		
289	ಮಾಲ್ಕೀ ವಹಿವಾಟು ಪತ್ರ	10	
290	ಪ್ರಾಪರ್ಟಿ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರ್ ನಕಲು (ಶಿವಕುಮಾರಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳ ಕಾಲದ್ದು)		1975
291	ಬಾಡಿಗೆದಾರರ ಯಾದಿ	08	
292	ಬಾಡಿಗೆದಾರರ ಯಾದಿ	24	
293	ಪಂಚಾಯದಸ್ತೆ (ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಡಂಬಳದ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿ ವಸತಿ ನಿಲಯ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಪಾಠಶಾಲೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದು)	02	
294	ಡಂಬಳ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಬಿನ್‌ಶೆತ್ತಿ ಹಿತ್ತಲ ಬಯಲು ಜಾಗದ ದಾನಪತ್ರ	08	1974
295	ಡಂಬಳ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ರಿ॥ ಸ॥ ನಂ॥ 407-408 ರ ನಡುವೆ ಹಾದು ಹೋದ ಹಳ್ಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಕುರಿತು.		1932
296	ಡಂಬಳ ಮಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ ಅಳಗಿ ಸಾ॥ ಡಂಬಳ ಇವರು ಶ್ರೀಮಠಕ್ಕೆ ಭೂದಾನ ಮಾಡಿದ ಪತ್ರ	04	1921
297	ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಬಸಯ್ಯ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಶ್ರೀಮಠಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡ ಮೊಖ್ತಿಯಾರ ಮತ್ತ ಕರಾರು ಪತ್ರ	04	1937
298	ಡಂಬಳದ ಗೋವಿಂದಪ್ಪ ಬಿಂನ್ ದುರಗಪ್ಪ ಇವರು ಶ್ರೀಮಠಕ್ಕೆ ನೀಡಿದ ದಾನಪತ್ರ		1880
299	ಮುತ್ತುಂಬಿ ಕೋಂ ಮಕ್ತುಮಸಾಬ್ ಸಾ॥ ಅಬ್ಬಿಗೇರಿ ಇವರು ಶ್ರೀಮಠಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಚನ ಪತ್ರ		
300	ತೋಟತಯ್ಯ ಬಿನ್ ಸದಾಶಿವಯ್ಯ 100 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರ ಕುರಿತು ಬರಕೊಂಡ ಕರಾರು ಪತ್ರ		1885
301	ಡಂಬಳದ ಬರಮಪ್ಪ ಮಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ ತಂದೆ ಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪ ಅಳಗಿ ಅವರ ದಾನ ಪತ್ರ (25 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗೆ		1917

	ಅಂಗಳ ಹಿತ್ತಲ)		
302	ಖರೀದಿ ಪತ್ರ (ಹೊಲದ್ದು)	06	1906
303	ಲಾವಣಿ ಕಾಗದ ಡಂಬಳ ಹೊಲದ ಕುರಿತು	12	1907
304	ಡಂಬಳದ ಜಮೀನುಗಳ ಲಾವಣಿದರ ವರ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ 150 ರೂಗಳ ಪತ್ರ	02	1937
305	ಡಂಬಳ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಜಮೀನಿನ 18 ವರ್ಷದ ಲಾವಣಿ ಪತ್ರ	04	1931
306	ಬಸಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪ ಬಿಂನ್ ಮರಬಸಪ್ಪ ಡಂಬಳ ಇವರು ಬರಕೊಟ್ಟ ಲಾವಣಿ ಪತ್ರ		1922
307	ಸಣ್ಣಪ್ಪಯ್ಯ ಸಾ॥ ಕೊಂಡೇನಹಳ್ಳಿಯವರು ಬರಕೊಟ್ಟ ಲಾವಣಿ ಪತ್ರ		1904
308	ಸಿದ್ಧಪ್ಪ ಬಿಂನ್ ಸಿದ್ಧಪ್ಪ ಪ್ಯಾಟಿ ಇವರು ಬರಕೊಟ್ಟ ಲಾವಣಿ ಪತ್ರ (ಡಂಬಳ)	02	1904
309	" " "	"	"
310	ಭರಮಪ್ಪ ಬಿಂನ್ ಈಶಪ್ಪ ಇವರು ಸನ್ನಿಧಿಗೆ ಕೋರಲಾವಣಿ ಪತ್ರ	04	1922
311	ಭೂಡನ ಸಾಬ್ ಭುರಾನಾಸಾಬ್ ತಾಂಬೋಟಿ ಸಾ॥ ಡಂಬಳ ಇವರು ಬರಕೊಟ್ಟ ಕೋರಲಾವಣಿ ಕಾಗದ (ಮಡಿ ಜಮೀನು)	02	1932
312	ರಾಜೇಸಾಬ್ ವಲ್ಲದ್ ಹುಸೇನ್ ಸಾಹೇಬ್ ಡಂಬಳ ಇವರು ಬರಕೊಟ್ಟ ಕೋರಲಾವಣಿ ಪತ್ರ		1932
313	ತೋಟಯ್ಯ ಬಿನ್ ಮಡಿವಾಳಯ್ಯ ಇವರು ಕವಲು ಲಾವಣಿ ಪತ್ರ ಬರಕೊಟ್ಟದ್ದು	04	1924
314	ಡಂಬಳದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸರಕಾರಿ ಬೀಳ ಜಾಗಾ ತೋಟದ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳ ಮರದ ವೃತ್ತಕ್ಕೆ ಇರೋದು ಪೂರ್ವಕ್ಕೆ 33 ಪಶ್ಚಿಮಕ್ಕೆ 34 ಚಕಬಂದಿ		1864
315	ಕರಜಿ/ಹುಕ್ಕೇರಿ ತಾಲೂಕು ಬೆಳಗಾಂವ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾದ ಪತ್ರ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಗುರುದತ್ತ ಮಹಾರಾಜ ಚರಿತ್ರೆ ಇದೆ	12	1910
316	ಲಾವಣಿ ಪತ್ರ (ಹೋಲ ಕೋರ ಕೊಟ್ಟದ್ದರ ಕುರಿತ)		1910
317	ಲಾವಣಿ ಪತ್ರ (ಹೋಲ ಕೋರ ಕೊಟ್ಟದ್ದರ ಕುರಿತ)		1910
318	ಲಾವಣಿ ಪತ್ರ (ಹೋಲ ಕೋರ ಕೊಟ್ಟದ್ದರ ಕುರಿತ)		1910
319	ವೀರಯ್ಯಾ ಬಿನ್ ರಾಚಯ್ಯನವರು ಬರಕೊಟ್ಟ ಲಾವಣಿ ಪತ್ರ ಡಂಬಳದ ಪೂರ್ವದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಮಠದ ಹೊಲದ ಕುರಿತು		1910
320	ಬಾಳಪ್ಪ ಬಿಂನ್ ನಿಂಗಪ್ಪ ಪ್ಯಾಟಿ ಸಾ॥ ಡಂಬಳ ನಿಂಮ ಹೆಸರ್ತಿ ಖಾತೆ ಇರುವ ಮಸಾರಿ ಮರಡಿ ನಂಬರ ಹೊಲ		1910
321	ಮುಂಡರಗಿ ಪೈಕಿ ಡಂಬಳದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಜಮೀನುಗಳ ಲಾವಣಿ ಕೋರ ಕಾಗದ ಪತ್ರ		1910
322	ಸಿದ್ಧಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪ ಬಿಂನ್ ಸಿದ್ಧಪ್ಪ ಪ್ಯಾಟಿ ಅವರು ಬರಕೊಟ್ಟ ಲಾವಣಿ ಕೋರ್ ಪತ್ರ		1896
323	" "		"
324	ಲಾವಣಿ ಕೋರ ಕಾಗದ		1900
325	ಲಾವಣಿ ಕೋರ ಕಾಗದ		1900
326	ಯಲ್ಲಣ್ಣಾ ಘೋಣಿ ಇವರ ಲಾವಣಿ ಕಾಗದ		1909
327	ಬಾಳಪ್ಪ ಬಿಂನ್ ಹನಮಪ್ಪ ಗಡಗಿ ಸಾ॥ ಡಂಬಳ ಶ್ರೀಗಳ ಯಿನಾಮ ಹೊಲಗಳಿಗೆ ಲಾವಣಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡದ್ದರ ಪತ್ರ	04	1906
328	ಭಂಡಾರ ಭರಮಣ್ಣ ವಗೈರೆ ಕಡಿಂದ ಖರೀದಿ ತಗೆದುಕೊಂಡ ಹಿತ್ತಲಜಾಗದ ಖರೀದಿ ಪತ್ರ		1906
329	ಕವಲು ಲಾವಣಿ ಪತ್ರ	02	1910
330	ಲಾವಣಿ ಕಾಗದ (ಹಿತ್ತಲ ಗೋಡಿಯದು)	02	1910
331	ಲಾವಣಿ ಪತ್ರಗಳು	02	1910
332	ಲಾವಣಿ ಪತ್ರಗಳು	02	1910
333	ಲಾವಣಿ ಬಾಂಡ ಪತ್ರಗಳು	02	1910
334	ಲಾವಣಿ ಬಾಂಡ ಪತ್ರಗಳು	02	1910
335	ಲಾವಣಿ ಬಾಂಡ ಪತ್ರಗಳು	02	1910
336	ಲಾವಣಿ ಬಾಂಡ ಪತ್ರಗಳು	02	1910
337	ಲಾವಣಿ ಬಾಂಡ ಪತ್ರಗಳು	02	1910
338	ಮುಂಡರಗಿ ತಾಲೂಕ ಡಂಬಳ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಜಮಿನುಗಳ ಪತ್ರಗಳು	14 8	1928

339	A request to Grant permission to make a tour.	02	
340	ರಾಚೋಟಿ ಮಲಿ ಗುರುತೋಂಟದಾರ್ಯರು ಬರಕೊಂಡ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಹತ್ಯಾರದಿಂದ ಪಾಸಿನ ಮುದ್ದತಗಾಗಿ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ ಅದ್ವಾನಿ	01	1896
341	ಮುಂಡರಗಿ ಕಲ್ಲುಮಠಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಟಬಾಗಿ ಹಿರೇಮಠದ ಷಣ್ಮುಖ ದೇವರನ್ನು ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಾಗಿ ನೇಮಿಸುವ ಕುರಿತು.		1910
342	ಪೇಪರದ ಕುರಿತು (ಆಯವ್ಯಯ)	02	1938
343	Certificate under ordinance No XXI of	02	1948
344	ಆಶೀರ್ವಾದ ಪತ್ರ		19 ನೇ.ಶ
345	ಮೋಜಣಿಯಾರ ಪತ್ರ (ಹೂವಿನಹಡಗಲಿಯ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಇರುವ ಹಂಪಸಾಗರದ್ದು)	04	1841
346	A latter to dist magistrate	04	1946
347	" "		1946
348	In the court of the first class sub judge	13	1926
349	This is an enquiry under senction 1907 the Bombay Public Trusts Act-1950	21	1952
350	ಶ್ರೀ ಮಠದಿಂದ ಮ್ಯಾಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಟರಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ our under section 440 of the police Act	02	1910
351	The official paper	03	
352	Petition to Dist Judge Ast gram division	02	1891
353	Judgment (appeal No 360)	05	1867
354	This an appeal Mahantayya		
355	Petition court of hospet	10	1867
356	Appeal No-53 of	10	1916
357	Order under CCP		1889
358	Request of Special Appeal	06	1875
359	Under article 226 of the constitution of India the petitioner above named respectfully	07	1977
360	ಲಾವಣಿ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟಗೊಳಿಸುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನೋಟಿಸ	02	1910
361	ಲಾವಣಿ ಕೋರ ಕಾಗದ	02	1910
362	ವಾದಿ ಪತ್ರ	04	
363	ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ನಮುನ್ಯದ ನಕಲು		1888
364	ಮುಲ್ತಾನಮಲ್ಲ ಹಜಾರಿಮಲ್ಲ ಜಾತಿ ಜೈನ ವ್ಯವಹಾರ ಪತ್ರ	04	1932
365	Proceedings of head assistant magistrate		1889
366	District police office Bellary		1904
367	ಚಿತ್ವಾಡಗಿ ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿಯ ಲಿಂಗಾಯತ ಮಠಕ್ಕೆ ಬ್ರಾಹ್ಮಣರ ಹರಕತು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರ ವಿವರ		1904
368	Appeal application order maledar and paper of the case		1948
369	The District magistrate dharwar	02	1912
370	Detail facts of the case sanction of the Ass-commissioner Koppal	02	1960
371	ವಾದಿ ಪತ್ರ	06	1905
372	ಧಾರವಾಡ 1 ನೇ ವರ್ಗ ಸಬ್‌ಜಜ್‌ಕೋರ್ಟನಿಂದಾ ಸನ್ 1827 ನೇ ಇಸ್ವಿ ಆಕ್ಟನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		1905
373	ವುತಾರ ಪತ್ರ ಶ್ರೀಮಠಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಕ್ತಾರಿ ಸಮ	02	1922
374	ಗದಗ ಬಿಡಕುಂದಿ ಸೀಮೆ ದೇಸಾಯಿ ಸಿಂದನೂರ ಇವರು ಶ್ರೀಮಠಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಕೊಟ್ಟ ಭೂಮಿಯಿನಾಮ ಪತ್ರ		
375			1922
376			
377	ಚಿಕ್ಕಹಂದಿಗೋಳದ ರಾಚಪ್ಪನವರ ಸಿರಿಗನಗೌಡರ ಬಿನ್ ಬಸವನಗೌಡ ಬರಕೊಟ್ಟ ಪತ್ರ		1927
378	ಕರಾರ ಪತ್ರ ಚಿಕ್ಕಹಂದಿಗೋಳದ ಅಯ್ಯಪ್ಪನು ಬರಕೊಟ್ಟದ್ದು		1909

379	ತೋಟದ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಶಲವಡಿ ಸಮಸ್ತ ದೈವದವರು ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		1927
380	ಕರಾರ ಪತ್ರ		1927
381	ಹಿರೇಹಂದಿಗೋಳ ಮಠದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಮುರಿಗೈಯ್ಯಾ ಬರಕೊಟ್ಟ ರಾಜಿನಾಮೆ ಪತ್ರ		1926
382	ಹಿರೇಹಂದಿಗೋಳದ ಅಂದಾನಗೌಡ ಬಸವನಗೌಡ ಬರಕೊಟ್ಟ ಕರಾರ ಪತ್ರ		
383	ಕರಾರ ಪತ್ರ		
384	ಬಿಂನ್ನಹಪತ್ರ		1923
385	ಕುಶಲೋಪರಿ ಪತ್ರ		
386	ಕುಶಲೋಪರಿ ಶ್ರೀಗಳವರ ಜೊತೆ		
387	ಕುಶಲೋಪರಿ ಶ್ರೀಗಳವರ ಜೊತೆ		
388	ಕುಶಲೋಪರಿ ಶ್ರೀಗಳವರ ಜೊತೆ		
389	ಕುಶಲೋಪರಿ ಶ್ರೀಗಳವರ ಜೊತೆ		
390	ಕುಶಲೋಪರಿ ಶ್ರೀಗಳವರ ಜೊತೆ	04	
391	ಕುಶಲೋಪರಿ ಪತ್ರ ಅಂದಾನಪ್ಪ ಚರಮೂರ್ತಿಗಳು ಶ್ರೀಗಳವರಿಗೆ		1923
392	ಶ್ರೀಗಳವರಿಗೆ ಅಂದಾನಪ್ಪನವರು ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		
393	" "		1923
394	ನೊಣವಿನಕೆರೆಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಶ್ರೀ ಕಾಡಸಿದ್ಧೇಶ್ವರ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳ ಮಠದ ವಿರಕ್ತಮಠದ ಚರಮೂರ್ತಿಗಳಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಕರಿವೃಷಭೇಂದ್ರ ದೇಶಿಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರು ಬರೆದ ವಿಲ್ ಪತ್ರ	12	1932
395	Court comount	02	
396	To the District court of Bellary petitioner	02	1931
397	Will act	02	1913
398	In the court of the main sift at Gadag		1965
399	In the court of the District Judge Bangalore Division (Petitioner)	20	1932
400	In the case the guestron at issue	-	1930
	ತಿಪಟೂರ ತಾಲೂಕ ನೊಣವಿನಕೆರೆ ಮಠದ ಕೋರ್ಟ ಕೇಸ್		
401	To probate the will of Shri Karibasavaswami of Sri Kadasiddeswaraswami matt, Nonavinakere- in the court of Dist Judge Bangalore	19	1933
402	ನೊಣವಿನಕೆರೆ ಮಠದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಶಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಬರೆದುಕೊಂಡ ಅಪ್ಲಿಕೇಶನ್	01	
403	" " " " ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಸಬ್‌ರಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರಾರ್‌ಗೆ	01	
404	ಮಠದ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಉಸ್ತುವಾರಿ ಬಗ್ಗೆ	02	
405	ಎಸ್ ಎಲ್. ನಂಜುಂಡಪ್ಪ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಸ್ಥಿರ ಮತ್ತು ಚರಾಸ್ತಿ ಬಗ್ಗೆ	01	
406	ಎಚ್.ವಿ. ನಾರಾಯಣರಾವ್ ಅಡ್ವೋಕೇಟ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಅಡ್ಜರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೇಳಲು	01	1932
407	ಗದಗ ಬ್ರ್ಯಾಂಚ್ ಮಠವಾಗಿ ನೊಣವಿನಕೆರೆ ಮಠ ಪಡೆದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ	01	
408	Original suit no. 49 Karibasavaswamy Vs Tontada Swamigalu	01	1931
409	ಶ್ರೀ ಕರಿಬಸವ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳಿಂದ ಬರೆಯಿಸಿದ ವಿಲ್	30	1932
410	Sri Karibasavaswami of Nonavinakere Mutt and his executing a will. (witnesses) Dist Judge Bangalore	11	1932
411	Diposition of A.N. Sreenivasa Rao 4th witness and cross examinitation (Dactor's statement about the treatment given to Karibasavaswami of Nonavinakere)	22	1933
412	Deposition of Rachappa 2nd witness for defendant.	04	1933
413	" " Channabasappa 3rd " "	03	1933
414	" " Channappa Setty 4th " "	03	1933
415	" " Yale Marulappa Setty 5th " "	02	1933
416	" " Channaveersetty 6th " "	02	1933
417	" " Basvalingasetty 7th " "	02	1933

418	" " Teerthappa 8th " "	02	1933
419	ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ವಕೀಲರನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸುವ ಫಾರ್ಮ	08	
420	ಗ್ರಾಮದ ತಲಾಟಿ ಸರಪಂಚರಿಗೆ ಆಸ್ತಿಯ ರಜಿಸ್ಟರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೃತ್ಯು ಪತ್ರದಂತೆ ದಾಖಲಿಸಲು	11	1960
421	ಯಡಿಯೂರು ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ಧಲಿಂಗೇಶ್ವರ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರ ಗದ್ದುಗೆ ದರ್ಶನಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವಾಗ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಗಳನ್ನು ತಡೆಯದೇ ಇರುವದು ಮತ್ತು ಕಳ್ಳಕಾಕರಿಂದ ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡುವ ಆರ್ಡರ್	08	1914
422	ಮನಿ (ವ) ಮಳಗಿ ಬಾಡಿಗೆ ಪತ್ರವು	21	
423	Appointment of a lawyer	01	
424	Permission to ֻars in cross palanquin (by commissioner)	03	1912
425	Notice to the owner maruti ginning factory Bannikoppa Raichur from Rajeshwari Prasad IAS statistics authority, national sample survey	03	1960
426	ಸಂಭಾಪೂರ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಹೊಲ, ಬೆಳಧಡಿ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಮನೆ ಖರೀದಿ ಪತ್ರ	06	1928
427	ಇಮಾಮಸಾಬ ಸೈ ಕಲಾಯಿಗಾರ ಇವರು ಬರಕೊಟ್ಟ ಬಾಡಿಗೆ ಪತ್ರ	02	1944
428	ಈರಯ್ಯ ವೀರಸಂಗಯ್ಯ ನರಗಣಾಚಾರಿ ಇವರು ಬರಕೊಟ್ಟ ಹೊಲದ ಲಾವಣಿ ಪತ್ರ	03	1918
429	ಭರಮಪ್ಪ ಶೇಣಿ ಸಾ॥ ಅಣ್ಣಿಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಲಾವಣಿ ಪತ್ರ	02	1930
430	ರಾಜೇಸಾಹೇಬ ಕಲ್ಲದನಬಿಸಾಹೇಬ ರಕಡೂರ ಸಾ॥ ಮುಂಡರಗಿ ಇವರ ಬಾಡೆ ಪತ್ರ	02	1902
431	ಹನುಮಪ್ಪ ಗೂಡಪ್ಪ ಕೂಗಲ್ಲ ಸಾ॥ ಮುಂಡರಗಿ ಬಾಡಿ ಪತ್ರ	02	1902
432	ವೀರಪ್ಪ ಯಂಕಣ್ಣ ಉಪ್ಪಾರ ಸಾ॥ ಮುಂಡರಗಿ ಇವರ ಬಾಡೆ ಪತ್ರ	02	1902
433	ರಾಮಪ್ಪ ತೊಂಡಿತೇರಪ್ಪಾ ಕೆರೆಗಲ್ಲ ಸಾ॥ಮುಂಡರಗಿ ಇವರ ಬಾಡೆ ಪತ್ರ	02	1902
434	ರಾಜೇಸಾಹೇಬ ಬಿನ್ ಫಕೀರಪ್ಪ ಹನಮಪ್ಪ ಸೂಳಿಕೆರೆ ಸಾ॥ ಮುಂಡರಗಿ ಭಾಡೆ ಪತ್ರ	02	1902
435	ಬೀರಪ್ಪ ಗೂಳಪ್ಪ ಕುಡತಿನಿ ಸಾ॥ ಮುಂಡರಗಿ ಇವರ ಬಾಡೆ ಪತ್ರ	02	1902
436	ಸಿಟಿ ಸರ್ವೆ ಕಛೇರಿಯಿಂದ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಬಾಡಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟದ್ದು	01	1939
437	ಬಾಡಿಗೆ ಜಮೆ	01	
438	ಶಿದ್ಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪ ಶಿವಪ್ಪಾ ಮೇಲಗಿರಿ ಸಾ॥ ಗದಗ ಭೂಮಿಯ ವಿಕ್ರಯ ದಾಖಲೆ	02	1931
439	ಗದಗ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಶಹರ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಟಿ ಕಚೇರಿಯಿಂದಾ ಬಾಡೆ ಪತ್ರ	01	1892
440	ರುದ್ರಯ್ಯ ಸೋಮಯ್ಯ ನರಗುಂದ ಸಾ॥ ಅಣ್ಣಿಗೇಲಿ ಇವರ ಲಾಪಣೆ ಪತ್ರ	03	1920
441	ಶಿವರುದ್ರಯ್ಯ ಸೋಮಯ್ಯ ನರಗುಂದ ಸಾ॥ ಅಣ್ಣಿಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಲಾವಣಿ ಪತ್ರ	03	1925
442	ಭೂನಸಿಂಗ ಅಮರಸಿಂಗ ರಜಪೂತ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಭಾಡೆ ಪತ್ರ	02	1934
443	ನಾಗೋಬಾ ವಿರೋಬಾ ಸೌದಾಗರ ಸಾ॥ ಗದಗ ಇವರ ಬಾಡೆ ಕರಾರ ಪತ್ರ	05	1934
444	ಹುಚ್ಚಪ್ಪ ಶರಬಣ್ಣ ಬಳಿಗಾರ ಸಾ॥ ಗುಳೇದಗುಡ್ಡ ಇವರ ಬಾಡೆ ಕರಾರ ಪತ್ರ	02	1934
445	ಯಶವಂತರಾವ ವೆಂಕಾಜಿ ಶಿಂದೆ ಸಾ॥ ಗದಗ ಇವರ ಬಾಡೆ ಪತ್ರ	03	1927
446	ಕಿಡಿಯಪ್ಪ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿಹಳ್ಳಿ ಸಾ॥ ಅಣ್ಣಿಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಲಾವಣಿ ಪತ್ರ	03	1925
447	ಸವಡಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಹಾಸಂಗಮೇಶ್ವರ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದ ರಥೋತ್ಸವ ಪತ್ರಿಕಾ	01	1958
448	ಇಸ್ಮಾಯಿಲಸಾಬ ಸೈಯದಸಾಬ ಕಲಾಯಿಗಾರ ಸಾ॥ ಗದಗ ಇವರ ಬಾಡೆ ಪತ್ರ	02	1915
449	ಶಂಭುಲಿಂಗನಗೌಡ ಅಂದಾನಿಗೌಡ ಪಾಟೀಲ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಬಾಡೆ ಪತ್ರ	02	1934
450	ಅಬ್ದುಲ್‌ಸಾಬ ಗೌಸೂಸಾಬ ಬೋಢ್ಲೆಖಾನ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಬಾಡೆ ಪತ್ರ	02	1934
451	ಪ್ರಭಣ್ಣ ಗಂಗಪ್ಪ ಶೀಲವಂತರ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಬಾಡೆ ಪತ್ರ	02	1934
452	ದಾಸಪ್ಪ ಜೀವಪ್ಪ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಬಾಡೆ ಪತ್ರ	02	1936
453	ರಾಮಣ್ಣ ಅಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ ಕೆಲಗೇರಿ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಬಾಡೆ ಪತ್ರ	02	1923
454	ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯ ರುದ್ರಯ್ಯ ಕೊಪ್ಪದಮಠ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಬಾಡೆ ಪತ್ರ	02	1934
455	ಅಮೃತಪ್ಪ ಜ್ಞಾನಪ್ಪ ರೋಣದ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಬಾಡೆ ಪತ್ರ	02	1934
456	ವೆಂಕೂಸಾ ನರಸಿಂಗಸಾ ಕಮಲಾಪೂರ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಬಾಡೆ ಪತ್ರ	02	1934
457	ಮುದಕಪ್ಪ ನರಸಪ್ಪ ಮ್ಯಾದಾರ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಬಾಡೆ ಪತ್ರ	02	1934
458	ಇಮಾಮಸಾಬ ಸೈಯದಸಾಬ ಕಲೀಗಾರ ಸಾ॥ ಗದಗ ಇವರ ಬಾಡೆ ಪತ್ರ	02	
459	" " "	02	1925
460	ಕಿಡಿಯಪ್ಪ ಚನಬಸಪ್ಪ ಹಳ್ಳಿ ಸಾ॥ ಅಣ್ಣಿಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಲಾವಣಿ ಪತ್ರ	03	1925

461		04	1930
462	ತಿಪ್ಪಣ್ಣ ಚಿಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ ದನಾಕಾಯ ಸಾ॥ ಅಣ್ಣಿಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಬಾಡಿಗೆ ಪತ್ರ	02	1942
463	ತಿಪ್ಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪ ನಿಂಗಪ್ಪ ಚಂದರಗಿ ಸಾ॥ ನವಲಗುಂದ ಇವರ ಲಾವಣಿ ಪತ್ರ	04	1937
464	ಈರಯ್ಯ ಗ್ಯಾನಯ್ಯ ನಿಡಗುಂದಿ ಸಾ॥ ಹೊಳೆ ಆಲೂರ ಇವರ ಬಾಡಿ ಪತ್ರ	02	1932
465	ಓಮೀಲಸಾಬ ಅಲ್ಲಿಸಾಬ ಅಬ್ಬೀಗೇರಿ ಸಾ॥ ಆಲೂರ ಇವರ ಭಾಡಿ ಪತ್ರ	01	1933
466	ಅಕ್ಕಮ್ಮಾ ಸಾಬಣ್ಣ ಮ್ಯಾದಾರ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಬಾಡಿ ಪತ್ರ	02	1934
467	ಚನ್ನಪ್ಪ ಬಸಪ್ಪ ಕೌಜಗೇರಿ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಬಾಡಿ ಪತ್ರ	02	1934
468	ಯಂಕಣ್ಣ ಕರೇಕಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ ದಾಸರ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಖಾಲಿ ಬಾಂಡ್ ಪೇಪರ್	01	1935
469	ಆನಂದಪ್ಪ ಮೋಶಪ್ಪ ಗುಂಡಿ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಖಾಲಿ ಬಾಂಡ್ ಪೇಪರ್	01	1935
470	ಕರೇಕಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ ಈಶ್ವರಪ್ಪ ಪದ್ಮಶಾಲಿ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಖಾಲಿ ಬಾಂಡ್ ಪೇಪರ್	01	1935
471	ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯ ರುದ್ರಯ್ಯ ಕೊಪ್ಪದಮಠ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಖಾಲಿ ಬಾಂಡ್ ಪೇಪರ್	01	1935
472	ರುದ್ರಯ್ಯ ನಾಗಯ್ಯ ಕೋಳಿವಾಡ ಚಿಕ್ಕಮಠ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಖಾಲಿ ಬಾಂಡ್ ಪೇಪರ್	01	1935
473	ವೆಂಕೂಸಾ ನರಸಿಂಗಸಾ ಕಮಲಾಪೂರ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಖಾಲಿ ಬಾಂಡ್ ಪೇಪರ್	01	1935
474	ಮುದಕಪ್ಪ ನರಸಪ್ಪ ಮ್ಯಾದಾರ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಖಾಲಿ ಬಾಂಡ್ ಪೇಪರ್	01	1935
475	ಚನ್ನಪ್ಪ ಬಸಪ್ಪ ಕೌಜಗೇರಿ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಖಾಲಿ ಬಾಂಡ್ ಪೇಪರ್	01	1935
476	ಮೂವರಸಿಂಗ ವುಮರಸಿಂಗ ರಜಪೂತ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಖಾಲಿ ಬಾಂಡ್ ಪೇಪರ್	01	1935
477	ಅಮೃತಪ್ಪ ಜ್ಞಾನಪ್ಪ ರೋಣದ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಖಾಲಿ ಬಾಂಡ್ ಪೇಪರ್	01	1935
478	ಆನಂದಪ್ಪ ಮೂಸೆಪ್ಪ ಗುಂಡಿ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಭಾಡಿ ಪತ್ರ	02	1934
479	ಯಂಕಪ್ಪ ಕರೆಕಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ ದಾಸರ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಭಾಡಿ ಪತ್ರ	02	1934
480	ಹನಮಂತಪ್ಪ ಫಕೀರಪ್ಪ ವಾಲ್ಮೀಕಿ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಭಾಡಿ ಪತ್ರ	02	1934
481	ಕರೇಕಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ ಈಶ್ವರಪ್ಪ ದಾಸರ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಭಾಡಿ ಪತ್ರ	02	1934
482	ಸಯ್ಯದಸಾಬ ಇಮಾಮಸಾಬ ಮುಳಗುಂದ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಭಾಡಿ ಪತ್ರ	02	1934
483	ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪ ಪಂಪಣ್ಣ ಬಿದರಿ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಬಾಡಿ ಪತ್ರ	02	1934
484	ಕನಕಪ್ಪ ಮಹಾದೇವಪ್ಪ ತಳವಾರ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಬಾಡಿ ಪತ್ರ	02	1934
485	ನಾಗಮ್ಮ ಬಸಪ್ಪ ಪಲ್ಲೇದ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಇವರ ಭಾಡಿ ಪತ್ರ	02	1934
486	Proceedings of the Govt of this highness the maharaja of Mysore	27	1914
487	ನರಗುಂದ ತಾಲೂಕ ಸೋಮಾಪೂರ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಜಮೀನ ಮಾರಾಟ ಜಾಹೀರ ಲಿಲಾವ	12	
488	ರಾಜವ್ವ ಇಮಾಮಸಾಬ ಕಮ್ಮಾರ ಸಾ॥ ಗದಗ ಇವರ ಬಾಡಿ ಪತ್ರ	02	1927
	ಸೋಮಾಪೂರ		
489	Suit by pl against arrears of rent Rs 1125/- (rough copy)	02	
490	At Bombay High court cross objections No 231 of 1939	02	1939
491	v/s Virabhadrayya .N. Shivappanmath for claim cshibit No 13	02	1937
492	ಇವರ ದಾವಾಕ್ಕೆ ಜವಾಬು	02	1937
493	Appeal No 231 of 1939 only cover page	11	1932-39
494	Stay order – civil application No 225 of 1939	04	1939
495	Judgement by the district court of dhawara	04	1939
496	Second appeal No 231 of 1939 for interim stay	04	1939
497	Stay order – civil application No 225 of 1939	04	1939
498	ಸಂಗಯ್ಯ ಸಂಗನಬಸಯ್ಯ ಹೆಸರೂರ ಸಾ॥ ಗದಗ ಇವರ ಬಾಡಿಗೆ ವಸೂಲಿ ಅಫಿಡವಿಟ್ಟು	05	1939
499	ಧಾರವಾಡ ಡಿ॥ ಜಡ್ಜರವರಿಗೆ ಅಪೀಲ ಪತ್ರಗಳ ಮಂಡಣೆ	02	1937
500	ಕಾರಣ ಕೇಳಿ ನೋಟಿಸು - ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟು ಮುಂಬಯಿ	02	1939

- - - - - *** * * * * ***- - - - - - -

500	Part-1 : R.A. Jahagirdar Dist: Dharwad first Appeal No – 241/1929 original C.S No 71/26 (File) I Kannada to English Translation	167	1929
501	Part-2 : R.A. Jahagirdar Dist: Dharwad first Appeal No – 241/1929 original C.S No 71/26 (File) I Kannada to English Translation	454	1929
502	Register of Inams in the village of Chittawadagi in the Taluk of Hospet in District of Bellary 4 attached stamp paper	04	1930
503	Register of Inams in the village of Hossur Tq: Hospet Dist: Bellary five attached stamp papers	05	1930
504	Telegraph from siddayya to Tontada swami in the matter of appeal hearing	01	1930
505	ಎಡೆಯೂರು ಸಿದ್ಧಲಿಂಗೇಶ್ವರ ಮಠದ ಆಯವ್ಯಯ ಪುಸ್ತಕ ನಂ – 2	37	
506	ಎಡೆಯೂರು ಸಿದ್ಧಲಿಂಗೇಶ್ವರ ಮಠದ ಆಯವ್ಯಯ ಪುಸ್ತಕ ನಂ – 4	16	1917
507	ದಾನಪತ್ರ	01	1890
508	ಹೊಂಬಳದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಂಗಪ್ಪ ಮೈಲಾರಿ ಇವರ ಬಿನ್ನಹದ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಪೂಜ್ಯರ ಅಡ್ಡಪಲ್ಲಕ್ಕಿ ಉತ್ಸವ ಮೇರವಣಿಗೆ ಜರುಗಿದ್ದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ	01	1914
509	ವೀರಭದ್ರಯ್ಯ ಮುಂಡರಗಿ ಸಾ॥ ಕುರ್ತಕೋಟಿ ಇವರು ಮಠಕ್ಕೆ ಬರೆದ ದಾನಪತ್ರ	01	1906
510	ಪಾರಪ್ಪ ಅಂದಾನಪ್ಪ ಮೇಟಿ ಇವರ ದಾನಪತ್ರ ಸೇಜ ನಂಬರ 1134	02	1916
511	ಮಲಿಕೇಂದ್ರಗೌಡ ನಕ್ರಗೌಡ ಬಿನ ಅಜ್ಜನಗೌಡ ಪಾಟೀಲ ಇವರ ದಾನಪತ್ರ ನಂ-5	02	1910
512	ಶಿವಯ್ಯ ದಿಗ್ಗಾರಿ ಸಾ॥ ಲಕ್ಕುಂಡಿ ಇವರ ಭೂದಾನ ಪತ್ರ	02	1912
513	ಬಸಟ್ಟೆಪ್ಪ ಅಂಗಪ್ಪ ಕಬ್ಬಿ ಸಾ॥ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಇವರು ಬರೆದ ದಾನಪತ್ರ	01	1912
514	ಶ್ರೀಮಠದ ಬಾಂಡೆ ಸಾಮಾನುಗಳ ಯಾದಿ	01	1912
515	ಶಿರೋಳದ ಪೇಟಾ ನರಗುಂದರವರು ಶ್ರೀಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	01	
516	ಸಿ. ಅಂದಾನಯ್ಯ ಹಿರೇಮಠರವರು ಪೂಜ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	01	1937
517	ಪುಸ್ತಕ ರಶೀದಿ	01	1887
518	ಜಗದ್ಗುರು ತೋಂಟದಾರ್ಯ ಮಠದ ಜಮಾ ಖರ್ಚುಗಳ ಯಾದಿ	06	1925
519	ಮಹಾಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಿ ಪ್ರೇಸಿಂಗ್ ಕಂಪನಿ ಲಿಮಿಟೆಡ್ ಇದರ ಹಣಕಾಸು ವರದಿ		1900
520	ಶಾಲಾ ದಾಖಲೆ ಡಂಬಳ ಗದಗ	01	1950
521	ಬೆಲೂರ ತಾ॥ ಬಾದಾಮಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಹೋಲ ಲಾವಣಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು	01	1950-51
522	ಬೆಲೂರ ತಾ॥ ಬಾದಾಮಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಹೋಲ ಲಾವಣಿ ಹಾಗೂ ರೈತರ ಹೆಸರುಗಳು ಪಿವಂ 43/286	02	1950
523	ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ರೆಲ್ವೆ ಚಿತ್ರಪಟ	01	
524	ಪೂಜ್ಯರ ಜನನ ಪ್ರಮಾಣ ಪತ್ರ	01	1830
525	ಗದುಗಿನ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಂಗ್ ವ ಧರ್ಮ ದಾನ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರ ಲಿಸ್ಟ್	01	
526	ಉರ್ದು ಪತ್ರಗಳು	42	
527	ಮರಾಠಿ ಪತ್ರಗಳು	01	
528	ಲಾವಣಿ ಪತ್ರ	01	1950
529	ಲಾವಣಿ ಪತ್ರ	01	1950
530	ಹೆಸರುಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿ	01	
531	ಸಾವದಾನ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆ	01	1956
532	ಮುಂಡರಗಿ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಮಳಿಗೆಗಳ ಬಾಡಿಗೆ ವಸೂಲಿ ಯಾದಿ	01	
533	ಶ್ರೀಗಳ ಅಡ್ಡಪಲ್ಲಕ್ಕಿ ಉತ್ಸವದ ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆ ಪತ್ರ	01	1833
534	ಶ್ರೀಮಠದ ಜಾತ್ರಾ ಮಹೋತ್ಸವಕ್ಕೆ ವಸೂಲಾದ ಕಾಣಿಕೆ ಪಟ್ಟಿ ಯಾದಿ	01	1942
535	ಶ್ರೀಮಠದ ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೆಲವು ಜಮೀನುಗಳು ಪೂಜ್ಯರ ಹೆಸರಿಗೆ ಆಗದಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ	02	
536	ಶ್ರೀ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಏಜೆಂಟ್‌ರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ಧಯ್ಯನವರು ಶ್ರೀ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಏಜೆಂಟ್‌ರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಗಂಗಾಧರಯ್ಯ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದ ವ್ಯಾಜ್ಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ	01	
537	ಶ್ರೀ ಬಸವಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪ ಅಂದಾನೆಪ್ಪ ಕುಲಕರ್ಣಿ ಸಾ॥ ಲಕ್ಕುಂಡಿ ಇವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಆಸ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ	01	1912

	ಸಿದ್ರಾಮವ್ವ ಕೋಂ ಹನುಮವ್ವ ಗಾಣಿಗೇರ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಮೃತ್ಯು ಪತ್ರದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು		
538	ಕುರಡಗಿಯ ಅಡಿವೆಯ್ಯ ಹಿರೇಮಠ ಇವರು ಪೂಜ್ಯರನ್ನು ಲಗ್ನಕ್ಕೆ ಆಮಂತ್ರಿಸಲು	01	
539	ದಿ. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪ್ರಿಂಟಿಗ್ & ಪಬ್ಲಿಷಿಂಗ್ ಹೌಸ್ ಗದಗ ಇದರ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ್ ವರದಿ ಹಾಗೂ ಲೆಕ್ಕಗಳ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆ		1949
540	" " "		1951
541	ಜಮೀನು ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಡೆದ ವ್ಯಾಜ್ಯ	10	1926
542	ನರಸಾಪೂರ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಜಮೀನು ಖರೀದಿ ಪತ್ರ		1960
543	ಟ್ರಸ್ಟನಲ್ಲಾದ ನಿಯಮಗಳ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ	04	
544	ಸರಕಾರಿ ಜಮೀನುಗಳ ಗ್ರಾಮ ಯಾದಿ	03	
545	ವಿರುಪಾಕ್ಷಪ್ಪ ಮಾನ್ವಿ ಪ್ರೆಸಿಂಗ್ & ಜಿನ್ನಿಂಗ್ ಕಂಪನಿಯ ಹಣಕಾಸು ವ್ಯವಹಾರ ಪ್ರಕಟನೆ	01	1905
546	ಗದಗ ಮಹಾಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಿ ಪ್ರಿಸಿಂಗ್ & ಜಿನ್ನಿಂಗ್ ಕಂಪನಿ ಗದಗದ ಮುಖ್ತ್ಯಾರ ಪತ್ರ ಡಾಯಿರೆಕ್ಟರ್ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟು		1920
547	ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ಧಲಿಂಗೇಶ್ವರ ವಿಜಯತೆ ಸ್ತುತಿ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆ		-
548	ಮರಾಠಿ ಪತ್ರ ಎರಡು ಪತ್ರಗಳಿಗೆ		
549	ಆರ್.ಎಲ್. (ಪೋಸ್ಟ) ರಶೀದಿ		
550	120 ರೂಪಾಯಿಯ ಮೈಸೂರು ಬ್ಯಾಂಕಿನ ಚೆಕ್		1943
551	The Gadag pressing & jinnig company Ltd Notice	08	1906
552	ವಿರುಪಾಕ್ಷಪ್ಪ ದಂಡಪ್ಪಾ ಮಾನ್ವಿ ಪ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿಂಗ್ ಮತ್ತು ಜಿನಿಂಗ್ ಕಂಪನಿ ಗದಗ ನೋಟಿಸು		1906
553	ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ್ನಾ ಮೇಶಿನರಿ ಏಜೆಂಟ್ ಹುಬ್ಬಳ್ಳಿ ಇವರಿಂದ ಟ್ರಾಕ್ಟರ್ ರಿಪೇರಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪೂಜ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಪತ್ರ ಬಂದಿದ್ದು		1954
554	ರುದ್ರಪ್ಪ ರಾಜಣ್ಣ ಬಡಿಗೇರ ಇವರ ಭೂ ಭಾಡಿಗೆ ಪತ್ರ		-
555	ಆಶೀರ್ವಾದ ಪತ್ರ ಕೋರಿ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದು		1956
556	ಷಡಕ್ಷರಿ ದೇವರು ಬರಕೊಂಡ ಮುಖ್ತೆಯಾರ ಪತ್ರ ಫೈಲ್ 2		1918
557	ಪ್ರಪಂಚದ ಹುಟ್ಟು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜರಿಂದ (ಹರಪನಹಳ್ಳಿ) ಪೂಜ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಬಂದ ಪತ್ರ		
558	ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ಧೇಶ್ವರ ಸ್ತುತಿ		
559	ಮಠಕ್ಕೆ ಅರಬ್ಬೀ ಕುದುರೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಠದ ಏಜೆಂಟರಾದ ಎಲ್.ಎಫ್ ಜಾತಾನಿಯವರ ಪತ್ರ		1912
560	ಬಸವರಾಜ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿಗಳು ಅಲೂರು ಹಾನಗಲ್ಲಿನಿಂದ ಪೂಜ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಶಾಲಾ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		1911
561	ರಾಣಿ ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಅಂಗಧಾಳದಿಂದ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		1858
562	ಪೂಜ್ಯರು ಕುಮಾರಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರ ಸಮಾಧಿ ವೇಳೆಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಬಂದದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ದಾಖಲೆಯಾಗಿ ಪೋಸ್ಟ ರಸೀದಿ		1960
563	ತೋಂಟದಾರ್ಯ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳ ನಿಧನಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂತಾಪ ಸೂಚಿಸಿ ಎಸ್.ಜಿ ಹಳ್ಳಿ ಸೆಕ್ರೇಟರಿ, ಲೋಟಸ್ ಸರ್ಕಲ್ ಗದಗ ಬೆಳಗೇರಿಯವರ ಪತ್ರ		1960
564	ತರುಣ ಸಂಘ ಶಹಪೂರ ಪೇಟೆ ಗದಗ ಇವರ ಶ್ರದ್ಧಾಂಜಲಿ		1960
565	ಶ್ರೀ ಮುರುಘಾಮಠದಿಂದ ಪೂಜ್ಯರ ನಿಧನಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂತಾಪ ಸೂಚಿಸಿ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		1960
566	ಬ್ರಿಟೀಷ ಸರಕಾರದಿಂದ ಪೂಜ್ಯರ ನಿಧನಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂತಾಪ ಸೂಚಿಸಿ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		1910
567	ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗದಿಂದ ಶ್ರದ್ಧಾಂಜಲಿ ಪತ್ರ ಬಂದಿದ್ದು		1960
568	ಕೊಂಡಕುಂದಿ ಗಂಗಾಧರ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳು ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿಯಿಂದ ಆಶೀರ್ವಾದ ಕೋರಿ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		1953
569	ಶಿರಹಟ್ಟಿ ಫಕೀರಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಮಠದ ಶ್ರೀ ಫಕೀರ ಹೊಸೂರ ಮರಿದೇವರು ಮಾಡುವ ವಿಜ್ಞಾಪನಾ ಪತ್ರ		1954
570	ನವಲಗುಂದ ಗವಿಮಠದ ಬಸವಲಿಂಗಾಖ್ಯರು ಮಾಡುವ ವಿಜ್ಞಾಪನಾ ಪತ್ರ		1944
571	ಶಿರೋಳದಿಂದ ವಿರುಪಾಕ್ಷ ಮರಿದೇವರು ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		
572	ಹುಲಗಿ ಮಠದಿಂದ ಬಂದ ಪತ್ರ		
573	ಪ್ರವಚನ ಕುರಿತು ಬಂದ ಪತ್ರ		
574	ಗುರುಬಸವ ಮರಿದೇವರು ಪೂಜ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		
575	ಪೂಜ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಡಂಬಳ ಮಠದಿಂದ ಬಂದ ಪತ್ರ		
576	ಪೂಜ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಗಂಗಾಧರ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳಿಂದ ಬಂದ ಪತ್ರ		1952
577	ಬನ್ನಿಕೊಪ್ಪ ಮಠದ ಗುರುಬಸವಮೂರ್ತಿಗೆ ದೇವರು ಪೂಜ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		
578	The Right Honarable governer In Counsil Bombay ಇವರು		

	ಪೂಜ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		
579	ಅರಟಾಳ ರುದ್ರಗೌಡರು ಪೂಜ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		
580	ಮಠದ ಹಳೆಯ ಕಾಗದ ಪತ್ರಗಳ ಕುರಿತು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸರಕಾರದಿಂದ ಬಂದ ಪತ್ರ		
581	ಪೂಜ್ಯರ ಪ್ರವಾಸದ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರೊಟ್ಟಿಗಿರುವ ಸರಕು, ಸಾಮಾನುಗಳು, ಆಳು, ವಾಹನದ ಯಾದಿ, ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷನಲ್ಲಿ		1914
582	ನಾಗನಗೌಡ ಶ್ಯಾನಭೋಗರಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		
583	ನೆಗಳೂರು ಶ್ರೀ ಜ.ತೋಂ. ಪ್ರಾಯವೇಟ್ ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷ ಸ್ಕೂಲಿನ ಫಂಡಿನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸೊಸಾಯಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ರೇವು ಇಟ್ಟ ಜನರ ಬಾಬತ್ತು ಪ್ರತಿ	04	1923
584	ಬೆನಹಾಳದಿಂದ ಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪನವರ ಪತ್ರ	01	1933
585	Fec received rcceipt for copy granted	01	1883
586	ಗದಗ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಮುನ್ಸಿಪಾಲ್ಟಿಗೆ ಮಠದ ವತಿಯಿಂದ ಕನ್ನಡ ಶಾಲೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	01	1914
587	ಗದಗ ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಮುನ್ಸಿಪಾಲ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಮಠಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆಯಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	01	1933
588	ಬಸವ ಜಯಂತಿಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ಮುದ್ರನ ಪ್ರತಿ	01	1936
589	General Merchants Narayan Devarakere ಇವರಿಂದ ಬಂದ ಬಿಲ್ಲು	01	
590	ಅಣ್ಣಿಗೇರಿ ಮಠದ ಸಿದ್ಧಲಿಂಗ ಚರಮೂರ್ತಿಗಳು ಡಂಬಳ ಮಠದ ಶ್ರೀಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	01	
591	೮೦ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಬಿ.ಎಮ್. ಪಾಟೀಲರು ಟಿ.ಎಮ್.ಓ.. ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಪಡೆದ ರಶೀದಿ		1939
592	ಅಖಿಲ ಭಾರತ ಶಿವಾನುಭವ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ, ಧಾರವಾಡ ಇವರ ಶಿವಾನುಭವದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆ		1942
593	ರಾಚಯ್ಯ ಬಿಂನ ಚನ್ನವೀರಯ್ಯನವರು ರಾಣಿ ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	01	
594	ಮುಂಡರಗಿ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಹೊಲಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದ ವಿಚಾರಣಾ ಪ್ರತಿ ಸ್ಟಾಂಪ್ ಪೇಪರ್	01	
595	" " "		
596	" " "		
597	ಗದುಗಿನ ತೋಂಟದ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಮಠ ಹಾಗೂ ಅಂದಾನಿ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳ ಕೋರ್ಟ ಅಪೀಲು ಪತ್ರ	01	1875
598	P. Haridas Naidu BA.BL (High Court Vakil) ಇವರು ಶ್ರೀಮಠಕ್ಕೆ ಬರೆ ಪತ್ರ		1922
599	ಉತಾರ ಉತ್ತಂಗಿನ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ	02	1874
600	ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಸಮನ್ಸಿನ ನಕಲು		1881
601	ದಿ.ರಾಯಟ ಆನರೇಬಲ್ ಗವರನರ್ ಇನ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಬಾಂಬೆ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಸಿರಸಂಗಿ ಲಿಂಗರಾಜರು, ಅರಟಾಳ ರುದ್ರಗೌಡರು ಮುಂತಾದವರು ಮನವಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿ ತೋಂಟದಾರ್ಯ ಮಹಾಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಮಹಾರಾಜರಿಗೆ ನೀಡಿದಂತೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸ್ಥಾನಮಾನ ನೀಡಲು ಕೋರಿದ್ದಾರೆ.	04	1890
602	ಈ ಮನವಿಗೆ ಸಹಿಮಾಡಿದ ಆ ಕಾಲದ ಗಣ್ಯ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗಳ ಸಹಿಗಳ ಪುರವಣಿ	52	1890
603	The court of the Head Asst Mazistrate Hospete ಇವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರಯ್ಯ ಹಾಗೂ ತಂಬ್ರಳ್ಳಿ ಲಿಂಗಾಯತ ಸಮಾಜದ ಇತರರು ಮನವಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದು	04	1904
604	ನೊಣವಿನಕೇರಿ ಶ್ರೀಗಳು ಶ್ರೀ ತೋಂಟದಾರ್ಯ ಜಗದ್ಗುರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	01	1931
605	ಅದೇ	02	1931
606	Secretary Muzarai Dept. Mysore ಅವರ ಆದೇಶ	04	1915
607	ಅದೇ (ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ)	02	1914
608	ಅಣ್ಣಿಗೇರಿ ಮುರಿಗೆಶಿಯವರ ಪತ್ರ	01	1793
609	ನೊಣವಿನಕೇರಿ ಅಂದಿನ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳ ಪತ್ರ	01	1931
610	ಮುಂಬಯಿ ಲಿಂಗಾಯತ ವೀರಶೈವ ಫಂಡ ಪ್ರಕಟನೆ	19	1905
611	ನೊಣವಿನಕೇರಿ ಮಠದ ಪತ್ರ	02	1919
612	ರಾವಬಹುದ್ದೂರ ಎಸ್.ಟಿ. ಕಂಬಳಿಯವರ ಭಾಷಣ	24	1925
613	ಧಾರವಾಡ ಪ್ರಾಂತಿಕ ವೀರಶೈವ ಶಿವಾನುಭವ ಸಮ್ಮೇಳನ ಗದಗ ಕೋಟಿ ತೋಟಪ್ಪನವರ ಭಾಷಣ	04	1925
614	ಇಟಗಿ ದೇಸಾಯಿ ಚೋಳಪ್ಪನವರ ಪತ್ರ	02	1800
615	ತಂಬ್ರಳ್ಳಿ ದೈವದವರು ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		1826 ಶಕೆ
616	ರಾವಬಹದ್ದೂರ ಅರಟಾಳ ರುದ್ರಗೌಡರಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	01	1919
617	ಕೂಗಲೆಯಿಂದ ದೇಸಾಯಿಯವರು ಶ್ರೀಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	02	18 ನೇ.ಶ

ಅನಂ	ವಿಷಯ	ಪುಟ	ಇಸ್ವಿ
601	ದಿ.ರಾಯಟ ಆನರೇಬಲ್ ಗವರನರ್ ಇನ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಬಾಂಬೆ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಸಿರಸಂಗಿ ಲಿಂಗರಾಜರು, ಅರಟಾಳ ರುದ್ರಗೌಡರು ಮುಂತಾದವರು ಮನವಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿ ತೋಂಟದಾರ್ಯ ಮಹಾಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಮಹಾರಾಜರಿಗೆ ನೀಡಿದಂತೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸ್ಥಾನಮಾನ ನೀಡಲು ಕೋರಿದ್ದಾರೆ.	04	1890
602	ಈ ಮನವಿಗೆ ಸಹಿಮಾಡಿದ ಆ ಕಾಲದ ಗಣ್ಯ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗಳ ಸಹಿಗಳ ಪುರವಣಿ	52	1890
603	The court of the Head Asst Mazistrate Hospete ಇವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟುರಯ್ಯ ಹಾಗೂ ತಂಬ್ರಳ್ಳಿ ಲಿಂಗಾಯತ ಸಮಾಜದ ಇತರರು ಮನವಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದು	04	1904
604	ನೊಣವಿನಕೇರಿ ಶ್ರೀಗಳು ಶ್ರೀ ತೋಂಟದಾರ್ಯ ಜಗದ್ಗುರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	01	1931
605	ಅದೇ	02	1931
606	Secretary Muzarai Dept. Mysore ಅವರ ಆದೇಶ	04	1915
607	ಅದೇ (ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ)	02	1914
608	ಅಣ್ಣಿಗೇರಿ ಮುರಿಗೆಶಿಯವರ ಪತ್ರ	01	1793
609	ನೊಣವಿನಕೇರಿ ಅಂದಿನ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳ ಪತ್ರ	01	1931
610	ಮುಂಬಯಿ ಲಿಂಗಾಯತ ವೀರಶೈವ ಫಂಡ ಪ್ರಕಟನೆ	19	1905
611	ನೊಣವಿನಕೇರಿ ಮಠದ ಪತ್ರ	02	1919
612	ರಾವಬಹುದ್ದೂರ ಎಸ್.ಟಿ. ಕಂಬಳಿಯವರ ಭಾಷಣ	24	1925
613	ಧಾರವಾಡ ಪ್ರಾಂತಿಕ ವೀರಶೈವ ಶಿವಾನುಭವ ಸಮ್ಮೇಳನ ಗದಗ ಕೋಟಿ ತೋಟಪ್ಪನವರ ಭಾಷಣ	04	1925
614	ಇಟಗಿ ದೇಸಾಯಿ ಜೋಳಪ್ಪನವರ ಪತ್ರ	02	1800
615	ತಂಬ್ರಳ್ಳಿ ದೈವದವರು ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		1826 ಶಕೆ
616	ರಾವಬಹದ್ದೂರ ಅರಟಾಳ ರುದ್ರಗೌಡರಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	01	1919
617	ಕೂಗಳೆಯಿಂದ ದೇಸಾಯಿಯವರು ಶ್ರೀಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	02	18 ನೇ.ಶ
618	ಕೆಳದಿಮಲ್ಲಮ್ಮಾಜಿಯವರ ಪತ್ರ	01	1664
619	ಕರಿಬಸವ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಗಳಗಿ ಅಂದಾನಪ್ಪನವರು ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	02	19 ನೇ.ಶ
620	ನಿರೂಪ	01	17 ನೇ.ಶ
621	ಸುಂಕಕೊಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ	01	17 ನೇ.ಶ
622	ಬಸವಣ್ಣವರ ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತ ಚರಿತ್ರೆ	02	19 ನೇ.ಶ
623	Proceedings of the Govt. of Maharaja of Mysore	02	1915
624	ದಿ ರಾಯಿಟ ಆನರೇಬಲ್ ಗವರ್ನರ್ ಇನ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಬಾಂಬೆ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ ಮನವಿ		
625	ತೋಂಟದಾರ್ಯ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳ ಮಠದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಬಂಗಾರದ ವಿವರ	18	1917
626	ಕೌದಿ ಮಹಾಂತೇಶ್ವರರ ಆಮಂತ್ರಣ	01	1935
627	ಮುಂಡರಗಿ ಅನ್ನದಾನ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳ ಬೆರಳಚ್ಚು ಪತ್ರ	08	1927
628	ಕುಣಿಗಲ್ ತಹಶಿಲ್ದಾರರು ತೋಂಟದಾರ್ಯ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	02	1900
629	ಸರ್ ಎಸ್.ಟಿ. ಕಂಬಳಿಯವರ ಪತ್ರ	01	1911
630	ರಾವಬಹದ್ದೂರ ಅರಟಾಳ ರುದ್ರಗೌಡರು ತೋಂಟದಾರ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	04	1909
631	ರಾವಬಹದ್ದೂರ ಅರಟಾಳ ರುದ್ರಗೌಡರು ತೋಂಟದಾರ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	02	1909

618	ಕೆಳದಿಮಲ್ಲಮ್ಮಾಜಿಯವರ ಪತ್ರ	01	1664
619	ಕಲಿಬಸವ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಗಳಗಿ ಅಂದಾನಪ್ಪನವರು ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	02	19 ನೇ.ಶ
620	ನಿರೂಪ	01	17 ನೇ.ಶ
621	ಸುಂಕಕೊಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ	01	17 ನೇ.ಶ
622	ಬಸವಣ್ಣವರ ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತ ಚರಿತ್ರೆ	02	19 ನೇ.ಶ
623	Proceedings of the Govt. of Maharaja of Mysore	02	1915
624	ದಿ ರಾಯಿಟ ಆನರೇಬಲ್ ಗವರ್ನರ್ ಇನ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಬಾಂಬೆ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ ಮನವಿ		
625	ತೋಂಟದಾರ್ಯ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳ ಮಠದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಬಂಗಾರದ ವಿವರ	18	1917
626	ಕೌದಿ ಮಹಾಂತೇಶ್ವರರ ಆಮಂತ್ರಣ	01	1935
627	ಮುಂಡರಗಿ ಅನ್ನದಾನ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳ ಬೆರಳಚ್ಚು ಪತ್ರ	08	1927
628	ಕುಣಿಗಲ್ ತಹಶಿಲ್ದಾರರು ತೋಂಟದಾರ್ಯ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	02	1900
629	ಸರ್ ಎಸ್ ಟಿ. ಕಂಬಳಿಯವರ ಪತ್ರ	01	1911
630	ರಾವಬಹದ್ದೂರ ಅರಟಾಳ ರುದ್ರಗೌಡರು ತೋಂಟದಾರ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	04	1909
631	ರಾವಬಹದ್ದೂರ ಅರಟಾಳ ರುದ್ರಗೌಡರು ತೋಂಟದಾರ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರೆವ ಪತ್ರ	02	1909
632	ಕುಣಿಗಲ್ ತಾಲೂಕು ಯಡೆಯೂರಿನ ಪತ್ರ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ರಥೋತ್ಸವ ಕುರಿತಾಗಿ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		1915
633	ದಿವಾನ್ ವಿಶ್ವೇಶ್ವರಯ್ಯ ಮೈಸೂರು ಇವರಿಗೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಠದವರು ಕುಣಿಗಲ್ ತಾಲೂಕಿನ ಎಡೆಯೂರಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುವಾಗ 500 ಜನ, 100 ಚಕ್ಕಡಿ, 100 ಹತೆಯಾರ ನಮಗೆ ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		1912
634	ನೊಣವಿನಕೆರೆ ಕಾಡಸಿದ್ಧೇಶ್ವರ ಚರಮೂರ್ತಿಗಳು ಡಂಬಳದ ಜಗದ್ಗುರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರೆವ ಪತ್ರ	04	18 ನೇ.ಶ
635	ಹಿರೇಪುರಿ ದೊಡ್ಡ ರುದ್ರಯ್ಯನವರು ಸಿದ್ಧಲಿಂಗ ದೆಶಿಕೇಂದ್ರರಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಕ್ಷೇಮ ಸಮಾಚಾರದ ಪತ್ರ	02	1840
636	ನೊಣವಿನಕೆರೆ ಸಿದ್ಧೇಶ್ವರ ದೇವರು ಶ್ರೀಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ		18 ನೇ.ಶ
637	ಹಿರೇ ಸಾದಿಯ ಪತ್ರಗಳು ದೊಡ್ಡರುದ್ರಯ್ಯನವರ ಶ್ರೀಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರಗಳು		18 ನೇ.ಶ
637	ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಅಡಫಾಲ್ಕಿ ಮೆರವಣಿಗೆಗೆ ಯಾವ ತೊಂದರೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ಬರೆದ ಕಲೆಕ್ಟರ ಪತ್ರ	01	1905
638	ಶ್ರೀಗಳವರ ಕ್ಲಾರ್ಕ ಕೆ.ಎಚ್. ಕುಲಕರ್ಣಿಯವರು 1949 ಕ್ಕೆ ಉಯಿಲ್ ಪತ್ರ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದು ವಿನಂತಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ.	02	1949
639	ತುಂಡತುಂಡಿ ಗಂಗಾಧರ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳು ಆಶಿರ್ವಾದ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಬರುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಶಿವಕುಮಾರ ಶ್ರೀಗಳವರಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಓಲೆ	02	1960
640	ಶಿವಕುಮಾರಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿ ಇಟಗಿಯವರು ತೋಂಟದ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳವರಿಗೆ 150 ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕಳಿಸಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಆಗ್ರಹಪೂರ್ವಕ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	01	1932
641	ಶಿವಕುಮಾರರ ತೋಂಟದ ಮಹಾಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಇದ್ದ ಆಸ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಸಮಾಧಾನದಿಂದ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಬರೆಯುತ್ತಾ 150 ಹಣ ಕಳಿಸಲು ವಿನಂತಿಸಿದ ಪತ್ರ	01	1936
642	ಶಿವಕುಮಾರರು ಸಿದ್ಧಯ್ಯನವರಿಗೆ 200 ರೂ ಕಳಿಸಲು ಪತ್ರ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದೆ ಆದರೆ 50 ರೂ ಕಳಿಸಿದ್ದಿರಿ ಹೇಗಾದರೂ ವಿಶ್ವಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಿ ಬಾಕಿ 150 ಈ ಕಳಿಸಲು ವಿನಂತಿಸಿದ ಪತ್ರ 21 ದಿನದಿಂದ ವಿಷಮ ಜ್ವರ ಇರುವ ವಿಷಯ	01	1936
643	ಇಟಗಿ ಶಿವಕುಮಾರರು ಗುರು ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ 100 ರೂ ಕಳಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ನೀವು ಕಳಿಯುವದು ಬೇಡ ಮರಳಿ ಬಾ ಎಂದರೆ ಬಂದು ಬಿಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅಂತಾ ಬರೆದುಕೊಂಡ ಪತ್ರ	02	1931
644	ಸೋಂ[illegible] ಶೇಷಗಿರಿ ಆಚಾರ ವಕೀಲರು 1949 ಕ್ಕೆ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಇದೆ ಹೋಟೆಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಡಬಲ್ ಬೆಡ್‌ರೂಮುಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾಯ್ದಿರಿಸಲು ತೋಂಟದ ಶ್ರೀಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	01	1949
645	ಶ್ರೀ ಗುರುಲಿಂಗಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರು ತೋಂಟದಾರ್ಯ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ಮುದ್ದತ್ತು ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಗಿದೆ ಜನೆವರಿ ತಿಂಗಳಿಗೆ ಬಿಳಬಹುದೆಂದು ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	01	1949
646	ಒಟ್ಟು ಮೊಕ್ತೆಯಾರ ಶಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಬ. ಹಿರೇಮಠ ವಿ. ಶಂಕರ ಬಾಳಕೃಷ್ಣ ಮರಾಠೆ 3 ಬಾಡೆ ಕರಾರ ಪತ್ರ ಸ.ನಂ. 3747/48 ಎ	02	1935
647	ಶಂಕರ ಬಾಳಕೃಷ್ಣ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಜವಾಬ ಕೊಡಲು ಪತ್ರ	01	1900
648	ವೆಸ್ಟ ಪೇಟೆಂಟ 1900 ಪತ್ರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು ಮುಟ್ಟಿದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ		
649	ಕಾಣಿಕಾ ಯಾದಿ		
650	ಪ್ರಾಂವಾದಿ ತರ್ಫೆ ಗದಗ, ಬೆಟಗೇರಿ ಲಕ್ಕುಂಡಿ ಡಂಬಳ ಹರ್ಲಾಪೂರ ಹೊಂಬಳ ಹಂಪಸಾಗರ ನರೆಗಲ್ ಜಕ್ಕಲಿ ಹೋಳೆಆಲೂರ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರ ಯಾದಿ ಮತ್ತು ಶಮನವಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಯಾದಿ	07 01	

651	ತೋಂಟದಾರ್ಯ ಮಹಾಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ದೊರೆಯತಕ್ಕ ಬಿರುದುಗಳ ಯಾದಿ	03	
652	ಹುಯಿಲಗೋಳದ ಹನುಮಂತಗೌಡ ಸಣ್ಣಗೌಡರ ಇವರು ಗದುಗಿನ ವೀರಭದ್ರಪ್ಪ ವಿ ಕೋಟಿ ಇವರಿಗೆ ತೋಂಟದಾರ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀಗಳಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನು ಲಾವಣಿ ಬಾಬತ್ತು 38 ಕೋಡಬೆಕೆಂದು ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	01	1949
653	ಶ್ರಿಗಳ ಸನ್ನಿಧಿಯಿಂದ 18 ಜೀಲ ಶೇಂಗಾ ಕಳಿಸಿದ್ದು ಇವನ್ನು ಮಾರಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕಳಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಬಾಕಿ ಮುರಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಾರದು ಅಂತಾ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜರಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	01	1948
654	ಬೆಳದಡಿಯ ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ ಗೋಸೆ ಇವರು ಶ್ರೀಗಳ ಸನ್ನಿಧಿಗೆ ಅಣ್ಣಿಗೇರಿ ರಿಸ.ನಂ 330, 331, 332-ಅ, 332-ಬ, ಇವುಗಳ 60 ರೂಗಳನ್ನು ಎಜೆಂಟ ಬಸನಗೌಡರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಪತ್ರ	02	1943
655	ಶ್ರೀಗಳ ಒಟ್ಟು ಮೊಕ್ತೆಯಾರ ಶ್ರೀ ಚಂದ್ರಶೇಖರ ದೇವರು ಶಿವನಗೌಡ ಕೆ. ಪಾಟೀಲ, ಸಣ್ಣ ಪಕೀರಪ್ಪ ಮೇಟಿ ವಗೈರೆರು ಸಾ॥ ಅಮರಗೋಳ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನು 80 ವರ್ಷ ಕಿರ್ದಿಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ಅವದಿ ಮುಗಿದಿದ್ದು ಹೊಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಬದುಕು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದಲ್ಲ. ಎಂದು ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	01	1948
656	ಶ್ರೀಗಳ ಸನ್ನಿಧಿಯಿಂದ ಶಿಕರಪ್ಪ ಇಲಕಲ್ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಸನ್ನಿದಿಯಿಂದ ಕಾಶಪ್ಪನನ್ನು ಕಳಿಸಲಾಗಿದ್ದು ಅಮೀನಗಡದ ಜಮೀನು ಲಾವಣಿ ರೂ ನಮಗೆ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ ತಾವು ಮುದ್ದಾಂ ಅಮೀನಗಡಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದು ವಸೂಲಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ.	01	1949
657	ಸ್ಟೇ ಡಿ..ಸಿ. 2 ತುಂಗಭದ್ರಾ ಇವರ ಸಹಿವುಳ್ಳ ಮಾಲ್ಕೀ ಕಾಲಂನಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಗಳ ಹೆಸರಿರುವ ಬಾಚೆನಹಳ್ಳಿ ಜಮೀನು ಭೂಮಾಲ್ಕಿ ವಿವರ	02	1948

K150

Paper charge
0-0-9

Copy applied for on 19/5/1913
Copy ready on 4/6/1913
Copy delivered or sent by V.P.P. on } 5/6/1913

Section Mr. Kale Rs As P 0-15-0
Examiner Vaskar } 0-5-0
Reader Lokan
Total 1-4-0
Rs. One and annas four only
4/6/13

Machine charges Rs As P 0-2-6
Annas two and pies six only to be credited to Govt
4/6/13

Judgment in Special Appeal No.277 of 1875.

Andana Swami Guru Andana Swami
(Original Defendant) Appellant.

Versus

Totada Swami Guru Totada Swami
(Original Plaintiff) Respondent.

Special Appeal from the decision of the Judge of Dharwar in Appeal No.360 of 1867.

This being a Special appeal, this Court cannot reverse the findings of the District Judge on the issues of fact directed by the late Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Gibbs, when this cause was remanded on the 6th July 1869 by the High Court for retrial, unless there be an error in law or in the investigation of the case, which has produced error or defect in the decision of it upon the merits, as for instance a total absence of evidence in support of the findings of fact.

It has been argued for the first Defendant (Appellant) that there is not any evidence to support the finding that the tenure upon which the Andana Math is held by the first Defendant was such that the Plaintiff was entitled to resume possession of it at his pleasure; and it has been further argued that the District Judge has overlooked the fact that in the Sanads (Exhibits No.114 and No.115) the Defendant is named as Inamdar, and, therefore, that there has been an error in the investigation of the case.

We find it quite impossible to say that there is no evidence to support the finding on the first issue on fact—as regards the tenure by which the Defendant held the Math and as to the right of the Plaintiff to resume it.

Exhibit 46 (dated in the Shakh year 1638 and Christian year 1716), though it relates to lands in another village, shows that the Totada Swami was then described as master of the ndana Math, apparently long before there were any Andana wamis. Thirteen witnesses (Nos. 153,154,162,167,177,181,182, 86,192,195,196,202 and 204) depose to the owhership of the 'laintiff and to his spiritual and temporal supremacy. Exhibit lo.50 signed by numerous Swamis, including (as third on the list) he Andana-Swami, is a clear acknowledgment of at least his piritual supremacy. The resumption of the Andana Math by the 'laintiff on the occurrence of the xxxxx lunacy of the first)efendant's immediate predecessor, and the administration hereof for four years by the Totada Swami were acts strongly ndicative of supreme temporal and spiritual authority, The unacy and resumption occurred in A.D.1844, at which time the)efendant was a desciple of the Plaintiff resident in the Math. 'he Defendant was nominated to the office of Andana Swami in 849, by the Plaintiff, although the Defendant has asserted, ut has failed to prove that he was elected to that office by ther persons. Again in Exhibits Nos. 71,72 (dated in 1861), 73 nd 74 (dated in 1862) which are Sanads. granted by the British overnment, of lands, which it is admitted are appendant to o the Andan Math, the lands are described as held by the An- ana Swami as Vyvatdar (corruptly Whywatdar) of the Totada wami. The learned Counsel for the first Defendant contends hat the opposite is the case, but grammatically the word Vyvatdar ould follow and not precede the name of the person describ- d as manager. So we have no doubt that the District Judge has 'ightly understood those documents. It is true that the lands entioned in them are not the lands in dispute, but being as hey are, lands appurtenant to the Andana Math although not in he same village with it, the inference is strong that the ndana Swami was merely the representative and agent of the otada Swami in holding those lands. It is true that the Dis- rict Judge has not mentioned the circumstance that the lands n dispute are stated in two Sanads (Exh.114 and 115) of 1862 s held by the Andana Swami. But we cannot thence infer that e overlooked that fact. Were we to lay it down as a general le that whenever a District Judge omits to mention a parti- ular item of evidence of more or less importance he must be regarded as having left it out of his consideration, scarcely any decree brought up here on special appeal could be sustained under such an ordeal. Moreover the fact that lands stand in a particular name in the Government books or in Government Sanads, though always of some importance, is far from being conclusive as to the ownership of the lands, as experience of many years has taught us here. And the ~~weig~~ weight of Exhibits 114 and 115 is, and was probably regarded by the District Judge as, much diminished by the circumstance, adverted to by him, in the last paragraph but two of his judgment, that in the "Official papers" viz the Sanads already mentioned as Exhibits 71, 72, 73 and 74 lands admitted to ~~the~~ be appurtenant to the Andana Math, but situate in another village, are described as managed by the Andana Swami for the Totada Swami. For these reasons we cannot say that there was not any evidence to support the finding of the District Judge that the tenure of the Math by the first Defendant, Andana Swami was such that the Plaintiff was entitled to resume the Math, and secondly that though the 1st Defendant's appointment as Andana Swami was complete, he is not entitled by virtue of his office to resume possession ~~a~~ of the Math -- the latter part of which finding on the second issue seems to follow on the finding upon the first issue. We also are unable to say that although the District Judge has not specially mentioned Exhibits 114 and 115 he must be regarded as not having taken them into his consideration and therefore committed an error in the investigation of the case. Holding these views, it is unnecessary for us to notice the facts of this case at any greater length. The decrees of the Courts below must be affirmed with costs.

Sd/- L. R. Westropp.

26th September 1876   Sd/- Nanabhai Haridas.

True Copy

Deputy Registrar.

Sealer.

The 4th day of June 1913.

2

Copy applied for by Totadmariguru Totad Swami of Gadag vat-moktiyar to Shriman Maharaj Niranjan - Jagadguru Tontad Mahaswami Saunsthan math Dambal. and Gadag. on 3rd September 1914

It was ready for delivery on 1st October 1914

It was delivered on 2nd October 1914

No. of words	Copying fee	Comparing fee	Paper charges.	otal
130	-·3-	--1-	--3	4-3

For Collector Dharwar.

No. 8811

Judicial Department:

Bombay Castle/ 6 3 December 1913.

TO,

Mr. Channa Basavayya Fakirayya Hungirimath and
other residents of Mundargi,
Dharwar.

Memorandum;

With reference to their memorial, dated the 9th October 1913, appealing against the order passed by the - District Magistrate Dharwar on the 9th August 1913, in -- which he intimated that, if preparations were made to carry the Annadan Swami of Gadag in a palanquin borne cross-wise or with the insignia of panch kalasa, orders would be issued under Section 144 of the Code of Criminal Procedure 1898 or Section 44 of the Bombay District Police Act, 1890, Mr.Chann Basavayy Fakirayya Hungirimath and others are informed that after careful consideration Government see no reason to interfere in the matter.

Sd/- A. F. Kindersley.
Under Secretary to Government.

" True Copy "

Compared by
[illegible]
clerk

For Collector Dharwar.

[illegible]

J (…)26 14,000 7-13 (02)

[illegible] ಜಡ್ಜಿ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ

[illegible] 122 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ಸೂಚನೆ— [illegible]

[illegible]

5 ( ) 15%—16,000—10-13—(02)—

Civ A 111 k.

[illegible]

[illegible] ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ [illegible] ಜಡ್ಜಿ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ.

[illegible] [illegible] ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ [illegible]

[illegible] ನಂಬರು ೨೭ ನೇ ೧೯೭೪ [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

౧౦౫ - [illegible]

[illegible]

౧ [illegible] - [illegible]

౨ [illegible]

౩ [illegible]

౪ [illegible]

౫ [illegible]

౬ [illegible]

౭ [illegible]

౮ [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

౧ [illegible]

౨ [illegible]

౩ [illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

౪ [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

౫ [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

౬ [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

౭ [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
౧ [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] ౧౨౧ [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

([illegible])

([illegible])

([illegible])

[illegible]

([illegible])

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

၂ [illegible]

၃ [illegible]

၄ [illegible]

၅ [illegible]

၆ [illegible]

౩ [illegible]

౪ [illegible]

౫ [illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]

६ [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

७ [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

([illegible]
[illegible])

([illegible])

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

([illegible])

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

([illegible])

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

([illegible])

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Order passed by E.Maconochie, the District Magistrate, Dharwar in the Cross Palanquin and Panch Kalasa case, of Annadanaswami of Mundaragi, under section 144.C.P.C. & Section 44 of Bom.Dist.Pol. Act. on the 9th August 1913.

……

ORDER.

In this case the question at issue is the correctness or otherwise of the claim put forward by the Annadanaswami of Gadag to be --- carried in cross palanquin with the insignia of Panch Kalasa and the effect of the finding on that issue as regards the District -- Magistrate's duty with respect to section 44 of the Bombay District Police Act, and section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code.

2. The claim of the Annadanaswami is contested by the Totadaswami of Gadag who asserts his spirtual and temporal superiority over the former and regards the exercise of the right claimed as derogatory to his own headship. The right of the Totadaswami to go in procession with cross palanquin and panch kalasa has been considered and admitted by the Collector and District Magistrate in his order of the 14th May 1903. Mr. Gibb found that the practice had been continuous for more that half a century and practically unopposed. In that case the opponents were the representatives of the Shringeri Swami, the chief spritual head of the Smarta Community. The dispute then was between the followers of two different religions. In the present case it is between the followers of two Maths belonging to the same religion and sect. The questions that I have to consider -- are as follows :-

(1) Is there satisfactory evidence that the right claimed by the Annadanaswami has been exercised unopposed for a substantial period ?

(2) If the exercise of the right claimed is permitted now, is there danger of obstruction or annoyance to the public or of a disturbance of the public tranquility .

I find on the first issue in the negative and on the second in the affirmative, for the following reasons

3. Eight witnesses of respectability and apparent independence -- were produced before me at Mundaragi, who said that they had seen the Annadanaswami going in cross palanquin for periods varying -- from 20 to 50 years. On the other hand Mr. Venkatrao

Narashingrao Nadagouda, the representative of the leading Desai family of that part of the country and a sardar of the Deccan -- states, that the practice dates from 1907 only at which time the -- Annadanaswami instituted a Jatra of his own. There is absolutely no documentary evidence as to the exercise of the right at any time up to the last year or so when the followers of the Totadaswami -- took objection to the proceedings. The evidence of the eight -- gentlemen above mentioned is entitled on the face of it to consideration. On the other hand due allowance must be made for the esteem in which the present Annadan swami is undoubtly, and to the best of my knowledge, deservedly held in Mundaragi and in the neighbourhood and the natural tendency to exalt a respected local dignitary. Considering the relations existing between two Maths as proved by documentary evidence I am unable in the absence of the clearest proof of the fact, to believe that the Totadnaswami would have permitted the right claimed to be exercised for the number of years alleged without protest. Mr. Venkatrao's account is consistent both with admitted facts and probabilities. The popularity -- and influence of the Annadanaswami Math are recent growth and it is natural that with the increase of funds and the institution of the new Jatra, the cermonies attending progress of the Swami should be elaborated. I hold therefore that the alleged practice is of recent institution and not of long standing.

3. Coming to the second issue the significance of cross palanquin and pench kalasa must be considered. The privilege of being carried on a palanquin cross ways is one that so far as my knowledge, is enjoyed only by swamis of maths of unquestioned pre-eminence. In Mysore the practice has varied at different times but at present it is admitted in the case of the Jagadguru of Shringeri alone. In British India practice is not so strict and the general tendency of judicial rulings is to maintain the right of different sects make such use as they like of the public streets, provided that they do not there by invade the rights of property enjoyed by others or cause a public nuisance or interfere with the ordinary use of the streets by the public. Where there is precedent for the use of Adpalki the privilege has been accorded in this Presidency to swamis such as the swami of the Muragi Math of Chitrakaldurg --

Chitrakaldurg irrespective of the view taken Mysore. The Panch Kalasa again is essentially an emblem of royal~~x~~ty or supreme priesthood.

Now the Totadaswami of Gadag whose preminent position along with that of the swami of the Murasaviramath of Hubli, is admitted -- claims that the Annadanaswami of Mundaregi is no more than his subordinate. The judgment of the High Court in special appeal No 277 of 1875 throws the clearest possible light on the respective positions of the two swamis. A document therein referred to dated A.D. 1716 describes the Totadaswami as "master of the Annadanamath and as their lordships add: apparently long before there was any Annadanaswami. Again " Ext.No. 50 signed by numerous swamis --- including as third in the list Annadanaswami is clear acknowledgement at least of his spiritual ~~xxxxx~~ supremacy. The resumption o the Annadanamath by the plaintiff of the occurance of the lunacy of the first defendants immediate predecessor and the administration thereof for four years by the Totadaswami were acts strongly indicative of supreme temporal and spiritual authority. The defendant was nominated to the office of Annadanaswami in 1849 by the plaintiff . In the present enquiry copy of a registered document has been produced dated 1853 in which the Annadanaswami --- styles himself with aspect to the Totadaswami " your obedient Annadanaswami" . Coming to more recent times a khata standing in the name of the last Annadanaswami was continued after his death in the same na-me . The Totadaswami obtained an heirship certificate and got his name substituted. An application was made to get the certificate cancelled but it was rejected by the First Class Sub-Judge Dharwar. The Annadanaswami then filed a suit for change of khata but withdrew it last year . Another ~~xxx~~ suit with respect to the Manakwad math is still pending. It is not within my province to decide whether Totadaswami is or is not the spiritual and temporal superior of the Annadanaswami . What I am concerned with is the ques-tion , whether the followers of the former have good reason to believe that he is, and to resent the assumpation by the latter of privileges implying his equality to an extent i.e. likely to cause a disturbance of the public tranquility. In my opinion the question must be answered in the affirmative.

5. It has been argued by consent that, whatever the case may have been once, the Annadanaswami is now independant and is at liberty to assume the insignia of supremacy. Further it has been urged -- that the followers of the Annadanaswami greatly out number the followers of the Totadaswami in Mundaragi, and that if they choose to carry their swami in cross palanquin they have every right, in view of judicial rulings, to do so, I am unable to accept either arguement. The practice of cross palanquin is in its very nature the cause of public obstruction and of interference with the ordinary use of the streets by the public. It is a direct ---- assertion of supremacy so far as the particular sect is concerned and a challenge to those of that sect who deny it. Where it has the sanction of long usage it may be admitted but it would directly contrary to the interest of the public order and peace to admit it in the case of every math that chooses to cut itself off from the parent institution. So far as Mundaragi itself is concerned there is some force in the second arguement. But if the right were admitted in Mundaragi it would be claimed elsewhere and the followers of the two swamis would be liable to come into conflict where-ever they are to be found living in the same place.

6. There is nothing to prevent the Annadanaswami going in procession in his palanquin carried in the ordinary manner and without the panch kalasa, but for the reasons given above, if preparations are made to use cross palanquin and the insignia specified, it will be necessary to issue orders under section 144 of the Criminal -- Procedure Code or section 44 of the Bombay District Police Act.

7. It appears that last year a new Annadanaswami appointed by the Totadaswami was carried in cross palanquin. This will not be --- permitted in future. The privilege attaches to the Totadaswami -- personally, and if it is prohibited in the case of the swami of the old Annadanamath, the prohibition must apply equally to any person hereby appointed by the Totadaswami.

Dharwar.
9-6-1913.

Sd/- F. Maconochie.
District Magistrate, Dharwar.

[illegible] 20-8-[illegible]

[illegible] 20-8 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Kumbhar

In the Court of the District Magistrate,

Dharwar.

Applicant :- Shree Kotadswami Guru Kotadswami o
Dambal and Gadag by his Muktyar
B.M. Patil.

Versus.

Opponent :- Shree Jagadgur Annadanswami Guru
Annadana Mahaswami Sansthan Mat
Mundargi by his Vat-muktyar Nit
Annadan Maridevaru.

The written statement of the opponent above named to the applicant's petition dated - 14-8-1940 is as under :-

1. The application is illegal and bad in law. It is incompetent under section 144 Cr. Pr. Code. It is not based upon facts calling in the aid of the said section and invoking the extraordinary powers of a Magistrate there under.

2. The application is barred in view of the recent order of the District Magistrate Dharwar dated 7-7-1940 passed after a thorough and m careful enquiry. The applicant has ~~x~~ been thereb directed to establish his claim if any in a civi court. The Applicant did not prefer either an ~~ap~~ appeal~~s~~ or revision petition. He therefore cannot agitate the matter over again. His applicati is vexatious and deserves to be dismissed summarly.

3. In the month of May 1940 about six p itions signed by about 400 ~~x~~ leaders of no less than 22 villages in the Mundargi Petha and by abo 200 prominent citizens of Mundargi, belonging to every community and caste, were submitted to the District Magistrate Dharwar on 28-5-40 praying for permission for taking the opponent (Shree Jagadguru ~~Abdan~~ Annadana Swami) in a cross palanquin - -

procession (with all the insignias) which - - they intended to do on Ashdha Shud Saptami i.e on 11-7-1940, During this long interval the District Magistrate made full and detailed enquiries through the D.S.P. and the Mahalkari o Mundargi as to the likelihood or otherwise of the breach of the Public peace or tranquility. On 19-6-1940, the applicant above named made a petition to the District Magistrate raising all the points before issuing his fina order on 7-7-1940. In short the applicant had enough time and opportunity to place his case before the District Magistrate and as a matter of fact he got his case strenuously urged by two pleaders . The District Magistrate after carefully considering all the objections raised and the likelihood of breach of peace passed the order on 7-7-40, The present - - application is barred by principle of Res - Judicate.

4. For the cross palanquin function, printed invitations had been issued far and wide. Besides this a general invitation was - published on 9-7-40, in "Sanyukta Karnatak" a widely circulated news paper in Karnatak (please vide annexture A.). On the appointed day more than 8 or 10 thousand people both of Mundargi and neighbouring villages assembled and took part in the procession which went off smoothly and without any resentment from anybody. It lasted several hours and ther was complete unanimity and peaceful atmosphere in the town of Mundargi (vide annexture B). Not a single person has so far complained to t authorities that the procession hurt his - - feelings and that it was in any way provocativ It is therefore evident that though the proces ion was arranged and taken out so openly and

on such a large scale there has been uptil now no sign of discontentment on the part of the public including the disciples of the applicant. Such being the case the present~~x~~ attempt of the applicant to make out a case of apprehended breach of peace must fall to the ground. The applicant's pl that he had not sufficient time to make out his f full case and so also his main ground that had the public come to know of the procession in good time there would have been breach of the peace~~x~~ are mere cloaks to rake up the matter again withou sufficient cause.

5. This opponent emphatically denies that it is the special or exclusive privilege of the applicant to ride in a cross-palanquin with ~~x~~ PanchaKalasa. The heads of the opponent's Math have been enjoying the said privilege from time immemorial. Besides there are several high priests of the Lingayat Community who enjoy it likewise. The opponent's Math is independent and has thousands of disciples who owe exclusive allegience to ~~d~~ the opponent. The Swamis of the opponent's Math on account of the high rank and dignity are exempted from personal appearance in all Civil Courts by the Government of Bombay,-They have disciples not only in the whole of Karnatak but in all the native states in the Deccan.

6. What is stated in paras 3 and 4 of the application is not true. The allegations that the opponent is not an independent swamy, that his predecessors in office were appointed by the applicant Math to supervise the distribution of food and that the Opponent's Math is subordinate to that of the applicant are false. The appeal Judgments therein referred to did not concern the question of going in a procession at all. They concerned ~~wonership~~ ownership of property. At any rate the ~~x~~ effect of these judgments is~~x~~ now completely wiped out by the recent judgment of the High Court - -

of Bombay, in favour of the opponent in 1935 (vide annexture C - -/ Appeal judgment No. 241 of 1929 dated 1-10-1935.). Refering to the High Court Judgment relied upon ~~tx~~ by the applicant Justice Barlee observed " We are not concerned with the - reasons given for the decision, but must note th the defendent (opponent) had asserted in course of the suit that he had been elected to the office of [illegible] ~~Andaneswami~~ of Mundargi Math not by the Totad Swa but by other~~s~~ persons." Lower ~~down~~ down it is furthe observed He (Andanswami No.1 predecessor of the predecessor of the opponent) did not say that he h withdrawn his allegiance, nor did he speak about his new Math; but by implication he denied all the rights claimed by the Totad Swami." Further down is remarked "But Andanswami No.1 did not give up h claim to be the [illegible] holder of the Math at - - Mundergi., and a new Math was built for him or by him. "Still further down" It appearsto us therefor that time began to ~~m~~ run against the Totad Swami i or about the year 1860 when Andanaswami No.1 denie his right~~s~~ to resume the property. Lastly the - judgment says "At the most it shows that there may have ~~b~~ been a friendly meeting between the - heads of the Maths, but it is extremely improbable that there was homage. The applicant applied to - the High Court for permission to appeal to the Privy Council. While rejecting that application Barlee and Divatia J. J. said "Therefore following the recognised principle that documents must be read as a whole and their effect must not be judged by isolated passages, we decided that these documents contained no admission of any inferior status. " (vide - annexture D Appli.No. 168 of 1936 dated 16-7-1936). Thus their Lordships have thrown overboard the appli cant's bogus fling that the opponent is his subordin ate. The Swamis of the opponent's Math have all along asserted their independence and maintained it throughout.

7. What the applicant has said in sub-paras A & B of para 5 is incorrect and facts a nd contents of the documents are either twisted or exaggerated A t any rates those documents have no more legal - force in view of the recent jedgment of the Honourable High Court in C.A. No. 241 of 1929 and C. - Application No. 158 of 1936 in as much as all the documents and orders and judgments rlied upon by the applicant werebased upon the High Court Judgment passed in 277 of1875. Now that judgment has lost its force . Therefore these documents and past - orders S. Nos. iii, iv, v, vi, the so called trump cards of the applicant automatically fall to the - ground. They had been produced in the suit ultimately decided in favour of the opponent by the High Court in C.A. No. 241 of 1929. It is now therefore futile for him to rely upon them any more, either to show the inferior status of the opponent or to deny his right to go in a cross palanquin on that ground. S.Nos. 1 and ii under A do not concern the opponent.

The judgment referred to in Sub Clause B also bear the same oweful tale and are worse than useless, by reason of the recent judgment of the High Court. But however it may also be noted that in that litigation no finality was reached on merits viz the existence of privileges claimed by the contending parties. No doubt the Trial Court - decided that question on merits, being influenced by the judgment of the High Court of the year 1875 referred to above. But in the appeals filed against it both the District Court and the High Court held that the consideration of that point on merits was beyond the jurisdiction of the Civil Courts. There fore the Trial Court's judgment on merits became ultravires and the question remained undecided. It is curious that the applicat still attempts to rely upon them like a drowning man. The rights and privileges of the opponent were never lost. The previous orders of the Magistrates were all influenced by the High Court's decision that the opponent Math was subordinate to that of the applicant. The reasoning was if that was the decision the disciples of the applicant might become enraged and that might lead to a disturbance. Hence those prohibitive - - orders on the ground of public peace. Not only that reason had disappeared but considerable weighty - local public opinion was leaning towards the opponent when the order was passed on, 7-7-1940.

9. What is alleged in para 7 is utterly false. It is not true that a ll the facts and the previous history was not brought to the notice of the District Magistrate. It is not true that the applicant was kept in the dark. In this connection applicant's petition dated 19-7-40, may kindly be looked into. The opponent did not make any application himself. The disciples and the Bhaktas - - approached the then District Magistrate and the applicant opposed the, that application and the counter application were fully enquired into by the Local Police and the Magistrate. Even the learned Sub- Divisional Magistrate was consulted in the - matter. (please vide the order of the District Magistrate dated 7-7-40). The opponent learns that the local police and the Magistrate have recorded even the statements of the disciples of the applicant.

10. The opponent learns that the applicant again approached the District Magistrate and the D.S.P. with his pleaders for reconsidering the order but failed to convince them .

11. What is stated in para 9 is neither correct nor tenable. What the applicant claims is a right to prevent everybody including the opponent from going in a cross palanquin. Therefore it is up

to him to establish such a right or privilege in a court of law on order that he may become - - entitled to a prohibitory order at the hands of the District Magistrate. The order dated 7-7-1940, is t this effect.

12. What is stated in para 10 is a pure hoax. The long and thorough enquiries made as well as the peaceful atmosphere prevailing at Mundargi amply prove the futality of such alarming statement The opponent learns that Mr. Gurappa Shattar, Mr. Shivajpgaya Andanappa Aggad, Mr. Guruchiddaya and other~~s~~ leading disciples of the applicant himself were amongst the signatories to the applications of the - - processionists. There was no opposition and no tense feeling as alleged. The opponent Swami is held in such high reverence that he commands respect not only from Lingayats but even from members of all other communitie The fact that 10000 assembled on 7-7-40, also speaks for itself.

13. What is stated in para 11 is also a lame~~s~~ excuse for raking up such a matter once decided. To have or not to have processions is always in the discretion of the disciples of the opponent. If people from other places invite, the opponent usually goes there for such processions. In the village of Vaddatti in the Miraj Mala Such cross palanquin procession of the opponent is held every year., at the instance of the residents of that place. Therefore this application should be dismissed for want of proper cause,

14. What is stated in para 12 is untenable in law on the facts and circumstances of the case.

15. What is stated in para 13 is utterly false. The applicant is not entitled to any relief prayed for.

16. The opponent prays that the police authorities may be consulted as to whether the procession of 7-7-1940, created tense feeling.

17. The opponent prays that he may be

permitted to produce documents, photographs and other evidence at the hearing.

For the reasons stated above the opponent prays that the application be summarily dismissed.

Dateed. 6-9-19[illegible]0,

SSH.

In the court of the District Magistrate,
Dharwar.

Applicant:- Shriman Nirajan Totad swami of Gadag.
Versus.

Opponent:- Shiman Nirajan Jagadguru Andanaswami of Mundergi.

Pleaders for the opponent above-named beg to put in the following documents:-

1. Samyuakta Karnatak dated 10-7-1940. Invitation to the public. A

2. -do- dated 16-7-1940. report as to the Addapalki procession at Mundargi on 11-7-1940. B

3. Judgment of the High Court passed in Appeal No. 241 of 1929. C

4. Do of do in C,Application No, 168 of 1936. D

5. Order passed by the District Magistrate Dharwar dated 7-7-1940. E

6. Bombay Government Resolution No. 8929/25-9-1920 exempting appearnce in civil courts. F.

7. Madras Government Resolution No. 2998/21-7-1924 exempting appearance in civil courts. G.

8. Bombay government Resolution No. [illegible]/4 of [illegible]-6-1939 exempting appearance in civil court. H.

9. Order by the District Magistrate dated [illegible] permitting Utsava. I.

10. Application to the District Magistrate by Totada Swami dated 19-6-1940 Opposing permission prayed for holding Addapalki procession by the residents of Mundargi Petha and Mundargi. J.

11. Photo of Cross-palanquin procession of the previous Swami at Yagatti, 1[illegible]-3-19[illegible]1. K.

12. Hand Bills issued by Veerappa Balappa Sangatti of Hirevadatti dated 15-3-1921 inviting the public for Cross palanquin procession. L.

13. Copy of correspondence regarding Lands at Hulgi Taluka Koppal 1660- M.

14. Certified Copy of statement of Bandeppanaik Guruppanaik of Mundargi dated 7-9-191[illegible] N.

15. Do. of [illegible] of do. O.

16. Do of Krishnappanaik Ramannaik of Do. P.

17. Copy of Do of Govind Raghonath Kulkarni of Do. Q.

ಅಷ್ಟ ಪಲ್ಲಕ್ಕಿ ಮಹೋತ್ಸವ.

ಶ್ರೀಮತ್ಪ್ರಣವ ನಿರಂಜನ

ಜಗದ್ಗುರು ಅನ್ನದಾನ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳು ಗುರು ಅನ್ನದಾನ ಮಹಾಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳು

ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನ ಮಠ ಮುಂಡರಗಿ ಇವರ

ಅಷ್ಟ ಪಲ್ಲಕ್ಕಿ ಮಹೋತ್ಸವ.

ತಾ – ೧೧-೭-೧೯೪೦ ನೇ ಗುರುವಾರ ಮುಂಜಾನೆ ೮ ಗಂಟೆಗೆ

ಮುಂಡರಗಿಯಲ್ಲಿ

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಗದ್ಗುರುಗಳವರ ಪಂಚಕಲಶ ಯುಕ್ತವಾದ ಅಷ್ಟ ಪಲ್ಲಕ್ಕಿ ಮಹೋತ್ಸವವು ಸಕಲ ಬಿರುದಾವಳಿಗಳೊಡನೆ ಮಹಾ ವೈಭವದಿಂದ ನಡೆಯುವದು. ಈ ಮಹೋತ್ಸವಕ್ಕೆ ಭಕ್ತಗಳೆಲ್ಲರು ಬಂದು ನೇತ್ರೋತ್ಸವ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಹಾಸ್ವಾಮಿ ದರ್ಶನಾಶೀರ್ವಾದಕ್ಕೆ ಪಾತ್ರರಾಗಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಕೋರುವ

ಮುಂಡರಗಿ.

ತಾ ೯-೭-೧೯೪೦.

ತಮ್ಮ

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಗದ್ಗುರು ಮಹಾಪೀಠದ
ಭಕ್ತರು.

Sayukta Karnataka Date 16th July 40

ಮುಂಡರಗಿ.

ತಾ. ೧೧. ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ನಿರಂಜನ ಜಗದ್ಗುರು ಅನ್ನದಾನ ಮಹಾಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳು ಗುರು ಅನ್ನದಾನ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಮಠ ಮುಂಡರಗಿ ಇವರುಗಳ ಅಷ್ಟ ಪಲ್ಲಕ್ಕಿ ಮಹೋತ್ಸವವು ನಿನ್ನೆ ಮುಂಜಾನೆ ಎಂಟು (೮) ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಶ್ರೀಗಳವರ ಮಠದಿಂದ ಹೊರಟಿತು. ಪ್ರಮುಖರು, ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಮೊದಲಾಗಿ ಬೀದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾವಿರಾರು. ಹಿಂದೆ ಭಕ್ತ ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಆರತಿಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ ನಡೆದಿದ್ದರು. ಊರಿನ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಬೀದಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತಿರುಗ್ತಾ ಉತ್ಸವವು ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನ ೧೨ ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಮಠಕ್ಕೆ ಮರಳಿತು. ಸಾಯಂಕಾಲ ೭ ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಮಠದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಹಾಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳವರ ಸನ್ನಿಧಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೀರ್ತನ ಪ್ರವಚನ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಗಳು ನಡೆದವು. ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಉಪದೇಶಾಮೃತದಿಂದ ಸಭಿಕರನ್ನು ಸಂತೃಪ್ತಿಗೊಳಿಸಿದರು. ಉತ್ಸವಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಊರುಗಳಿಂದ ಅನೇಕ ಮಹನೀಯರು ಬಂದಿದ್ದರು. ಶಿವ ಮಹಾಂತ ಪಂಡಿತರ ಪ್ರವಚನಕಾರರುಗಳು ಈ ಉತ್ಸವದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಿದ್ದರು. ಶುಕ್ರವಾರ ೧೦ ಸಾವಿರ ಜನ ಸ್ತ್ರೀಯರು ಉತ್ಸವದಲ್ಲಿ ನೆರೆದಿದ್ದರು. ಶ್ರೀಮಠ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರ ವೀರಭದ್ರ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿಗಳು ಸಕಲ ಆಧಾರ ಮನ್ನಿಸಿದ ನಂತರ ಉತ್ಸವವು ನಿರ್ವಿಘ್ನವಾಗಿ ಕೊನೆಗೊಂಡಿತು.

APPEAL No.241 OF 1929 FROM THE ORIGINAL DECREE.

Shriman Maharaj Niranjan Shri Tontadarya Mahaswami Guru Tontadarya Mahaswami . (Original Plaintiff.) Appellant.

Versus.

Andanappa bin Sangappa Shri and others. (Original Defedents Nos. 1 to 5, 7 to 13, 15 to 20, 22 to 31 and 33 to 36.) Respondents.

Appe al against the decision of B.V. Potdar, Esquire Joint First Class Sub-Ordinate Judge at Dharwar, in Special Civil suit No.74 of 1926.

Councel Mr. Coyjee with Mr. R.A. Jagirdar for the appellant.
Mr. G.R.Madbhavi for respondents Nos. 11, 15,17, & 19.
Mr. A.G. Desai for Respondent No. 21.

1st October 1935.

(Coram:- Barlee and Macklin JJ.)

Oral Judgment (Per Barlee,J.) This is an appeal from a decision of thd first class Sub-Ordinate Judge of Dharwar. The plaintiff styling himself Shriman Maharaj Niranjan Jagadguru Shri Tontadarya Mahaswami Guru Tontadarya Mahaswami, whom I shall call the Tontad Swami, sued to recover possession of the property mentioned in the plaint from the 37 defendents. He claimed that he, as Swami was the head of the Lingayat Community and of the Principle Math of that Community in the Gadag Taluka. This Math, he alleged, had branches at various places including a branch in the village of Mundargi. The management of those branches was carried on his behalf by a deciple appointed by him. The Lands insuit he alleged appertained to the Math at Mundargi, and the vahivat of this Math and of the lands was carried on by one Andanswami as his deciple upto January 1926 when he died. Thereafter the Plaintiff Tontad Swami became entitled to the said Math under property and no one else had any title. In spite of this the defendents , he alleged, had begun to carry out the vahivat of the Math and the property, and they - refused to deliver up possession to him when called upon to do so: and therefore he had brought this suit, The defendents in answer to his demands had alleged that they had been given authority by the deceased Andanaswami to make an appointment of the successor to him, but he, the plaintiff denied that the deceased Andanaswami had any authority to make such appointments to authorise such an appointmen

The Defendents pleaded that the Mundargi Math has not Subordi-ate to the plaintiff's Math, but that the deceased Andanaswami , the head of the Mundargi Math was an independent Swami and in - -

accordance with the traditions of this Math had obtained his authority independently. They alleged that before his death the deceased Andanaswami had made a will by which he had authorised defendents Nos. 1 to 21 to appoint a successor in his place the consent of the devotees of the Math and that in accordance with this authority given by the will and with the consent of defendents Nos. 1 to 21, defendent No. 22 had been installed as the Swami of the Mundargi Math. ~~They~~

They alleged that the deceased Andanaswami had been to the successor of the Mundargi Andanaswami who died in 1888 and that after his death the head of the plaintiff's Math had made efforts to obtain possession of the lands belonging to the Mundargi Math, and had applied to the Revenue Officers to have them entered in his name, but had failed.

They alluded to a decree of this court in 1876 by which it hd been decided that the Tontadswami had an authority over the Mundargi Math and had an authority to resume the lands and property of that Math, and alleged that after that decree the plaintiff Tontad Swami who had been the plaintiff in that case had appointed a deciple to the Mundargi Math and had given him the name of Andanaswami Guru Tontadswami, but that the then Andanaswami had built another Math in oppositionto the original Math with the help of his devotees and that they had carried on an independent management of the Sansthan.

The Principle questions at issue in the suit were whether the plaintiff's title to the suit properties is proved, and whether the defendents had succeeded in showing that he had obtained title by adverse position. The Learned Sub-Ordinate Judge held that the plaintiff's Math had had title to the suit properties, but that that right had been lost by adverse position, because he decided the case in favour of the defendents.

The quarrel between these two Maths began so long as 1853 or 1857. There is a document exibit 234 at page 8 of the Paper Book which embodies a statement made by ~~in~~ the then Andanaswami Guru Andanswami whom I shall call Andanaswami First. He complained to the Police Patil that his Math had been interfered with by the Tontad Swami of the day, who I shall call Tontad Swami First, and pleaded that he was entitled to possession of the Mundargi Math. He admitted that according to practice the installation of the Swami of the Math Mundargi was in the hands of Tontad Swami of Dombal, that in accordance with that practice the defendent, Tontad Swami, he installed him in the Mundargi Math six or seven years before, and that there was existing between him and the Tontad Swami a relation of deciple and Guru; but he claimed that as long as he lived he was the owner of the moveable property and the fields attached to the Math.

There after a suit was filed in Dharwar Court by the Tontad Swami first for possesion of the Math and lands appertaining there to The jedgment in the first and second Courts are not on the recird but we have in exibit 197 a judgment of this Court in special appeal No. 277 of 1875 from the decision of the Judge at Dharwar in appeal No. 360 of 1867. The question before their Lordships was whether there was any error of law which will justify their interference in special appeal, i.e. what is called now a second appeal, and from the judgment it appearsthat the plaintiff Tontad Swami of the day had claimed a right to resume possession Mundargi Math and to Oust the Andanaswami whom he had installed at his pleasure. The Court held that there was noevident to justify the finding of the District Judge that the plaintiff was entitled to resume possession at his will. We are not concerned with the reasons given for this decision but I must note that the defendent had ascerted in the course of the suit that he had been elected to the office of Andanaswami of the Mundargi Math not by the Tontad swami, but by other persons. The finding of this court was that the Andanswami was merely a representative and agent of the Tontad swami in holding the lands and that the Tontadswami the plaintiff was entitled to resume the Math at his ~~wish~~ will.

This dicision was given in 1876. The sucessfull plamtiff appears to have had some dificulty in execution, and apparently though he was formly put in to possession in execution he was still abstructed by the defendent Andan swami I and he had to file a suit under section 9. of this specific Relief Act to recover Possession of the Math. Eventully he obtained possession in 1880.

Tontad Swami 1 died in 1884, and Andan Swami I died in 1888. He left a will, which is exhibit 245 at page 236 of the record. In this he stated that he was the Principal Guru of the Lingayat Community & that he was the Principal owner of the Math situate at Hundegi and therefore the Maths inam & lands situated in Bombay, Madras, Nizam and Mysore, and Patwardhan and other territories continue with him. He stated that he had named his successor in accordance with the power & right which he had & had appointed Andan Mari Sortur the owner of the Hundegi Math & property after him. This I may say is a denial of the claim which had been made by the Tontad Swami of the right of naming the successor to the Hundegi Math. He did not say that he had withdrawn his allegiance, nor did he speak about his new math; but by implication he denied all the rights claimed by Tontad Swami.

After this further disputes between the parties began about the entries in the Revenue papers in respect of the lands, the property of the Hundegi Math. Exhibit 247 at page 233 is an application made by the agent of Tontad Swami in this connection. He writes:-

The lands the khata of which stands in the name of our disciple Andan Swami and (the lands) also the khata of which stands in his name and against which Vahiwatdar is entered a Tontad Swami, belong to us and are of our ownership. Andanayya Charanti said that he was Andani Swami & fought hard with us alleging that the lands & maths as above situate in villages belonged to him and were of his ownership. Finally a decision was passed in the High Court to the effect among other things that Tontad Swami alone was the owner of the lands & maths standing in the nam name of Andani Swami accordingly we took into our possession through court the moveable and immoveable goods & property also; about which the said person had carried on litigation. I hear that as to the lands standing in the name of Andani Swami & the lands & Hatths against which the entry 'Andani Swami whiwilday Lolad Swami' has been made, which have not been mentioned in that, Andenaya has made an application to Government in collusion with some other persons in Hundug alleging that he is Andan Swami (and) that he is the hair to Andan Swami and that a false hairship inquiry had been held & that the lands & Hatths standing in the name of Andani Swami should be entered in his name. But we state as follows. Andani Swami Guru Lolad Swami is our disciple & before he died in Hanakwed he gave in to our possession (till) all the estate that was in his possession & died. Forty years must have elapsed since that took place. From that day up to this day no heirship inquiry has been held. There is no reason for us to make an application in respect of heirship inquiry."

and he therefore asked that these lands should be entered in his name. That was in 1884. As a result of this first revenue inquiry the revenue officer made an order that the name of Andan Swami should be entered against the name of Hundu land.

The next phase of the dispute in chronological order was in 1905, when Lolad Swami II the successor of the plaintiff of 1860, made an application for an heirship certificate under Regulation VIII of 1827 to the property of the predecessor of Andan Swami I, the man who is said to have died 40 years before the revenue inquiry began. This application was heard ex parte and granted, and an application exhibit 129, made by Andan Swami II to set aside the order was dismissed.

In 1908 the land in suit were entered in the name of Lolad Swami II in the Record of Rights and they remain in his name for some years. In that year Andan Swami II filed a civil suit No 518 of 1908 against Lolad Swami II in the court of the Sub-ordinate judge at Gadag. I shall deal with the document later on and merely mention here that he asked for declaration that he was the owner & vahiwatdar of the lands ... in suit, and was ~~then~~ entitled under Section 70 of the Revenue Code to have the khata of these lands, which stood in the name of defendants [illegible]

Guru Andani Swami who died in 1888. That is Andan Swami I.

This suit was withdrawn later on and the name of Andani Swami was entered in the Record of Rights. The extract of the Record of Rights is at page 92 in words of the paper book. The first entries are in column 4 under ~~section~~ the title: name of the holder;

Continuing with Andani Swami Guru Andani Swami Hunderagi Math Shree Jagadguru Totad Swami Guru Totad Swami Dambal.

In the next extract at page 93 with reference to the name of the registered occupant (khatedar) the name is 'Shree Jagadguru Totad Swami Guru Totad Swami Sansthan Math Dambal'. And the name of the then Kabjedar is "Andan Swami Guru Andan Swami Hunderagi.

This concludes a survey of the documents connected with the disp between the parties up to the date of this suit and it is clear the Tontad Swami was declared to be the owner of the lands of the lands of the Hunderagi Math by this court in 1876, that he ousted the defendant Andan Swami I, from the Math and the lands then in suit, and appointed a disciple in his place. But Andan Swami I did not give up his claim to be the rightful holder of the Math at Hunderagi and a new Math was built for him or by him, and he retained possession of the lands in suit, or some of the lands in suit, which had come into his possession on his installation as Andan Swami of Hunderagi Math. It is also clear that Andan Swami II was never recognised by the holder of the parent Math and derived no title from him, but that he was in possession of the lands in suit from the death of Andan Swami I in 1888 till he died.

The principle question in this ~~[illegible]~~ appeal is whether the learned Subordinate Judge was correct in saying that the defendant Andan Swami III has established his title by adverse possession against Tontad Swami III. Before dealing with that I must mention that the Desai on behalf of the respondent Andan Swami II is not satisfied with the decision of the learned judge that the plaintiff's title to the suit property was proved. The learned advocate has pointed out that a number of these lands in the present suit has been acquired by the holder of the new Hundergi Matt, that is Andan Swami Ⓣ since 1888 either by purchase or by gift, and his claim is that those which have been given were given to Andan Swami Ⓣ personally & cannot be claimed by the plaintiff as the properties of the old Hundergi Matt. In answer to this Mr. Coyajee has contended that these gifts were made not to Andan Swami personally, but to him as the holder of the Matt, and that if it be held the Matt has continued to be a subordinate Matt of the parent Matt at Dambal in Gadag, then the ~~tittle~~ title to the lands given must have vested in the holder of the parent Matt the plaintiff. The solution of the problem depends on the intention of the donor in each case, and it does not seem to have been seriously contested in the lower court. We have been shown no evidence to throw light on the matter and we do not intend to go into it, for in our opinion the appeal can be decided on the other issues in the case.

Mr. Coyajee on behalf of the appellant has stated two principal propositions. The first is that an agent can not alter the nature and character of his possession, and that his possession can not become adverse unless it's proved that the possession became adverse to the principal to his knowledge and to his acquiescence. The second is that if the holder of a Matt alienates property adverse possession does not run against it until the death of the alienating alienor, and that if the successor of the holder does not sue the presumption is that he acquiesces in the alienation. His acquiescence amounts to a fresh alienation for his lifetime only. The learned Advocate would have us decide that there can be no adverse possession against Tontad Swami, inasmuch as on each change in the person of the holder of the Matt a further cause of action arises to recover the property which has been lost to the Matt.

The first authority on which this proposition is based is that of Vidya Varuthi Thirtha v. Balusami Ayyar (1921) L.R. 48 I.A. 302. That was a case of an alienation by a permanent lease. It was held.—

Except for unavoidable necessity, the head of a math can not create any interest in the math property to endure beyond his life. A lessee however, has not adverse possession under article 144 of the schedule above named until the death of the head who granted the lease. If the lessee's possession is consented to by the succeeding head, that consent can be referable only to a new tenancy created by him, and there is no adverse possession until his death.

At page 327 of the judgement we find the following remarks.
According to the well settled law of India (apart from the question of necessity which does not here arise) a Mahant is incompetent to create any interest in respect of the math property to endure beyond his life. With regard to Mahant No 2, he was vested with a power similarly limited. He permitted the plaintiff to continue in possession and received the rent during his life. The receipt of rent was with the knowledge which must be imputed to him that the tenancy created by his predecessor ended with ~~tenancy~~ his predecessor's life and can therefore only be properly referable to a new tenancy created by himself. It was within his power to continue the tenancy during his life, and in these circumstances the proper inference is that it was so continued and consequently the possession never became adverse until his death.

This principle has been extended to an alienation by sale in Mahanth Ram Charan Das v. Munshi Naurangi Lal (1933) 35 Bom L.R. 530. Mr. Coyajee argues that in our case the alienation of Tarlad Swami II merely amounted to an alienation for the period of his own life, and that at his death his successor the plaintiff Tarlad Swami III obtained a cause of action to sue for the recovery of the property.

These decisions are of course good law and binding on us, but with respect we do not think that they are applicable to the facts of the case before us. Here we have not a case of application by a Mahant for the period of his life. The alienation in suit was first effected by the installation of Andan Swami's in or about the year 1850. It has been held by this court that Tonlad Swami had the power to resume the Math property and the property appertaining to it at his pleas and the Court gave effect to this power by giving him a decr in the Suit of 1860. By his alienation, then, he created no an estate limited by his own life, but a tenancy at will. After the Suit Andan Swami was in the position of a tenan who continues to be in possession of the leased property after his tenancy has been terminated by the land lord. Tonlad Swami I not only could but did sue for the possession of the Math, and he could have sued for all the property which had gone in to the hands of the Andan Swami the defendant in 1860 at the time of his installation. It appears to us therefore that time began to run against the Tonlad Swami in or about the year 1860, when the Andan Swami I denied his right to resume the property. Andan Swami II in any case was not an alienee, but was from the begining an usurper. According to the decision of this Court the [illegible] Swami [illegible] the successor to the Math at Nandargi vest

in Tonlad Swami and not in the Andan Swami I who was only a vahiwatdar. There fore Andan Swami II never had any title but was trespasser from the very begining. Nevertheless, he held the property against the Tonlad Swami for the whole of his life and it is difficult, to see how his possession can be said to be anything but adverse

Mr. Coyajee has sought to solve this difficulty with great ingenuity. He relies on three documents; the first is the document of 1867 which I have already referred to in which Andan Swami I stated to the police patil that he had ~~begun~~ been appointed by the Tonlad Swami and that he was entitled to the possession of the property as long as he lived. He claimed a right to possession for life and no more. The second document is the plaintiff in in Suit No. 516 of 1908 which was brought by Andan Swami II for for a declaration that he was the owner and vahiwatdar of the lands in suit, some of which are now in suit. The passag on which the learned counsel relies is at page 117. In referring to the suit No. 562 of 1860 in which his predecessor had been unsuccessfull, he said that the lands claimed by him had not been included in that suit, that the lands in suit had never been in the possession of the plaintiff in that suit, and then went on to say —

At the time of that suit and even prior to it, the said estates were by virtue of his installation, under the vahiwat of the Guru of the plaintiff, Andani Swami Guru Andani Swami who had been installed And the said estates are the estates belonging to the gadi By virtue of his installation. The said Andani Swami Guru Andani Swami carried on vahiwat (management), as owner till his death. And even the plaintiff who came to his gadi after him has been since his death up till to-day carrying on management (vahiwat) of the said estates as owner."

The third document to which the learned Counsel has referred is the plaint in civil suit No. 16 of 1924 filed by Andan Swami II the predecessor of the present respondent against several persons for possession of a Math and lands attached to it, in which he stated that he was the presiding

Swami of a Math at Hundargi which owned the property in suit, and that the defendants ancestor had been put in charge of the Math and lands in suit as a servant & had passed an agreement on 6th February 1860. The second issue in that suit runs thus -

"It is proved that the document executed by the predecessor of the defendants had been passed by Sangayya bin Ayyappa to the plaintiff Math" and this was decided in the affirmative. Mr Soyagie claims that these three documents are evidence that Andan Swami I had ~~been~~ claimed no more than a life interest & had conceded the right of resumption on his death, and that Andan Swami II who was claiming to be the legitimate successor of Andan Swami I made no higher claim since he claimed that his title was based on the installation of his predecessor by the Fontad Swami

This inference if it is possible one from the documents which I have read is based on short passages extracted from long documents principally the passage extracted from the plaint in suit No 518 of 1908. But reading that plaint as a whole, I find that it was never the intention of Andan Swami II, to admit that he was a mere life tenant or that the Tontad Swami had any rights in the Mundargi Math at all. He says in paragraph 3:-

"The defendent has no right, title or interest in the estates in suit." In paragraph 4 he says ——

"~~The of~~ Recently the guru of the guru of the defendent i.e. Tontad Swami I, had instituted a suit, original suit No. 562 of 1860, in the first class court of Dharwar, alleging that the deceased, Andani Swami, the guru of the plaintiff was his disciple, and that he should be given possession of the estate managed by him in the capacity of a disciple. In that suit the said deceased Andani Swami had put forth contentions to the effect that he was not the disciple and had carried on proceedings".

Further on he says ——

"The estates in this suit were not included in that suit. Even after possession was obtained in that way the said deceased Andani Swami carried on Wahivat (management) as before of his other estates, i.e. of the estates in suit and some other estate, as owner, and an independent manner, and without regard for the defendent, till his death, i.e, till the year 1888, and then died. Granting that the defendent ~~&~~ his Guru had any right whatsoever over the estates in suit, ~~and~~ as the said deceased Andani Swami putting forth contentions in the above mentioned suit, i.e. since the year 1860 at least that "he is not my Guru and I am not his disciple". had carried on the Vahivat (management) of the said estates in an independent maner and without regard to for him, naturally that became adverse, that Vahivat (management) against the defendent." and in paragraph (c) of the prayer on page 128, he states categorically that there had been adverse position from 1860.

I need not read any more of this document. Reading it as a whole it is quite clear that Andani Swami II had no intention of conceding anything. He denied the

Title of the Tontad Swami and pleaded that even if he had had a title it has been lost by adverse possession. The passage to which Mr. Coyajee has referred is a somewhat lame attempt to show that inspite of every thing his predecessor and he were legitimate holders of the Mundargi Math, and based their title not on usurpation but on legitimate succession.

There are the only two points which have been pressed by the learned Counsel for the appellant, and in our opinion he has failed. I must mention briefly the oral evidence which was led by the plaintiff to prove that Andanu Swami II, the man who ~~he had~~ succeeded the defendant of 1860 had "attorned" to the Tontad Swami of the day. The witness Tontad Devaru, exhibit 386, the Dewan of Tontad Math when examined for the plaintiff stated, 'the predecessor of the present respondent had come to the Tontad Swami and paid homage to him and took Ashram from him and went away'. The only evidence on the point is the deposition of the editor of a news paper who produced a copy of an article which he had written in 1901, to the effect that the Andana Swami of Dambal (sic) had gone to Shri A Tontad Swami, and had come under his shelter, and had requested him 'that he had removed all the differences existing in his mind', and

"Thus the Shri Andana Swami met the latter having entered the Math of Totad Swami and thus they became united."

This is led as evidence that Andanu Swami II recognised the position of the Tontad Swami II and agreed to hold his land and math at his hands. The learned Judge had disbelieved this evidence, and in our opinion it is not worthy of any serious consideration. At the most it shows that there may have been a friendly meeting between the heads of the Maths, but it is extremely improbable that there was any homage. In fact since the Tontad Swami had already appointed ~~the~~ a Swami to the Mundargi Math, it is almost impossible to suppose that he could have recognised Andanu Swami II as the head of the Math.

The last point I would notice is a complaint by Mr. Desai, that the plaintiff had no cause of action to file the suit owing to the fact that his predecessor was still alive. Tontad Swami died in 6th November 1926, and the suit was filed by the present Tontad Swami in July 1926. The explanation which has been accepted by the learned Sub-Ordinate Judge, and seems to us to be sufficient, is that the Tontad Swami ~~the~~ II had relinquished his control of the Math, and had handed it over to his successor, the plaintiff, in 1926.

The Appeal is dismissed with costs.

Civil application admitted. No order as to costs.

Per Macklin J. — I agree and have nothing to add.

By order of the Court
(sd.) M.A. Rao,
Acting Registrar.

"True - Copy)

Sd. x x x
Ag. Deputy Registrar
this 7th day of February 1936.

I

Civil Aplication No. 168 of 1936.

Shriman Niranjan Maharaj, Shri Tontadarya Mahaswami Guru Tontadarya - (Original plaintiff) ---- applicant.

Vs.

Nagbasya alias Rachaya bin Danaya Hiremath (Original ~~A~~ Defendant No. 2) ---- Opponant.

Application ~~for~~ praying for leave to appeal to his Majesty's Privy Council against the decision of the

Court (Barlee & Macklin J.J.) in first appeal No. 241 of 1929.

Mr. R.A. Jahagirdar for the applicant.

" A.G. Desai " " opponent.

16th July 1936.

(Coram — Barlee & Divatia J.J)

Oral judgment (per Barlee J); — This is an application on leave to appeal to the Privy Council against the decision of this Court in first appeal No. 241 of 1926.

The subject-matter of the appeal is more than Rs. 10,000/- but as our decree affirmed the decree of the Court below, the applicant has to show that his appeal involves some substantial question of law.

Mr. Jahagirdar's point of law is that his client, who is the Swami of a math, was not barred by limitation from ~~sto~~ suing to eject a trespasser, who had been in adverse possession of his predecessor for more than 12 years before his succession. The argument is based upon the authorities which have been cited by me in the course of my judgment. In Vaidya Varuthi Thirtha v. Balusami Ayya (1921) L.R. 48 I.A. 302, it was decided that inasmuch as the head of a math cannot create any interest in the Math property to endure beyond his life, a lessee has not adverse possession under article 144 until the death of the ~~head~~ head ~~the Math~~ who granted the lease. This principle was extended in the case of Mahanth Ram Charandas v. Munshi Naurangi Lal, (1933) 35 Bom. L.R. 530 to alienations by sales and Mr. Jahagirdar's claim is that the proposition he has put forward is a legitimate extension of the principle on which these two cases were decided.

In our opinion this contention cannot

succeed. The basis of this decision is that the authority of the head of the Math is limited. Except for a necessity he can only alienate the property of the Math for the term of his life. In Mahanth Ram Charan Das v. Munsi Naurangi Lal 35 Bom. L R. 530, it was decided that time began to run against the successor of the alienating mahant at the date of his succession, and the inference from this is that the title of the trespasser, the person in possession, became adverse to the successor after 12 years. Mr. Jahagirdar's proposition that though this possession might become adverse to the successor, it was only adverse to his life interest and not to the estates, is not deducible from this principle.

In our opinion this is not a substantial question of law which will justify us giving leave to appeal to the Privy Council, since a substantial question of law must have some legal bases, and no legal basis for the ~~possession~~ proposition has been put before us. We cannot treat an involuntary alienation as if it was a voluntary alienation.

The second point put forward by the learned advocate is that the decision of this Court was based also on the interpretation of three documents, and that the interpretation of documents is a question of law. This is undoubtedly a fact. But with respect I dont find that ~~the~~ our decision was based on the interpretation of doubtful passages in documents. An attempt was made to show that the predecessor of the present opponent had admitted that he was a Vahiwatdar, and not an independent owner of the Math which he claimed, and this argument was based on — as I have said — on one or two produced in the Suit. We found that ~~there~~ though there was isolated statement — which might bear this interpretation the whole trend of the arguement of the opponent's predecessor was that he was an independent holder of the estate, a fact which he ascert~~ed~~ definitely at various places. Therefore following ~~effect must not be judged~~ the recognised principles that documents must be read as a whole and their effect must not be judged by isolated passages, we decide that these documents contain no admission of an inferior Status.

there is In the Circumstances we do not think that the question of law which would justify our granting leave to appeal to the Privy Council, and as these are the only two points put before us, we reject this application with Costs.

By order of the Court,
(Sd.) R.S. Bhavadekar,
Registrar.

True copy
Sd. M.G. Rao.
Offg. Deputy Registrar
the 28th day of September 1936.

Sd. x x x
Sectiony.

Copying fee 0-14-0. 7F1s.
Comparing fee 0-3-0
Total Rs. 1-1-0.
Rupee one and annas one only.

Counting folios 0-2-0.
Sealing fee 0-1-0.
0-3-0.
Total Rs. 0-3-0
Annas three only.

0-14-0. to Govt.
0-3-0 R.U. Kalo
1-1-0. Total
Rupee one and annas one only.

Sd. x x x
Deputy Sheristadar
28-9-36.

Read :- Application dated 28-5-40 from the residents of Mundargi Petha and deciples Shri Jagat Guru Andana Mahaswami Andanswami of Mundargi through their pleader Rao Bahadur E.S.Sawakar and Rao Bahd-urB.L.Patil.

2) Application dated 19-6-40 from the watmoktiyar Shiday Bassaya Hiremath of Tontad Swami Math, Gadag and Dambal through his pleaders Messrs. V.G. Koti and S.S.Malimath

3) Report of the District Superintendent of Police Dharwa No. 832 of 20-6-40.

4) Report of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, No.2307 dated 1-7-40.

and 5) Report of the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, F.C. III Dn., Dharwar, No. P.C.L.224 dated 5-7-40.

....

No. P.O.L.S.R.253
Office of the District Magistrate,
Dharwar, 7-7-40.

Memo :-

The applicants, residents of Mundargi and deciples of Shri Annadani Swami Math of Mundargi request permission to take out cross palanquin procession of Shri - Annadani Swami of Mundargi on 1-7-40 , through the streets of Mundargi. The Police Sub-Inspector and also the Mahalkari Mundargi report that there is no objection to grant the permission as there is no likelihood of breach of peace and no obstruction to traffic would be caused thereby. After - considering objection raised by Shriman Tontadswami of Gadag The District Superintendent and the Sub-Divisional Magistrate also have reported that there is no objection to grant the permission. Since it is reported all the officers and stated by the applicants also in their application that there is no likelihood of breach of the peace and no obstruction to the traffic would be caused, hence the District Magistrate Dharwar has also no objection to the applicants taking out the cross palanquin procession in question if it is customary to do so and subject to the condition that they should obtain the necessary pass from the Police authorities for the possession after specifying the route, timings etc. of the procession as required by the District Police Act

2). If Shriman Tontad Swami and his deciples consider the proposed crossed palanquin procession to be derogatory to their religious custom, it is open to them to approach a Competent Civil Court.

Sd. D.S. Modak.
District Magistrate Dharwar.

Copy to :—

(1) The applicants through their pleaders
(2) The opponents through their pleaders.
(3) The District Superintend of Police Dist. Dharwar w.cs
(4) The S.D.M. FC III Division
Dharwar, w.cs.
(5) The police Sub-Inspector of Mundargi
for Information and guidance.
(6) The Mamlatdar of Mundargi for Information.

Sd D.S Modak
District Magistrate Dharwar

Civil Courts.

Exemption from personal appearance in of Shri Jagat-guru, Annadani Swami of Mundargi, one of the chief priests of the Lingayat Community in the Deccan

Government of Bombay.

Judicial Department

Resolution No. 8928

Secretariat, Fort, Bombay,

Dated, the 25th September 1920

Memorandum from the Commissioner S.D. No. L.A.W. 41, dated the 20th August 1920.

Forwarding with his recommendation the following letter No. L A W. S R. - 31, dated 31st July 1920, to his address from the Collector of Dharwar.

"I have the honour to request that Government may kindly be moved to exempt Shri Jagut Guru Annadaniswami of Mundargi, from personal appearance in the Civil Courts under Section 133 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908

* 2. "The Swami is one of the chief priests of the Lingayat Community in the whole of the Deccan and is held in great veneration by them. He possesses about 1000 acres of land, attached to about 66 maths, scattered over the Bombay & the Madras Presidencies. He has established an "Annachatram", in his Math at Mundargi where food is offered to the poor and to travellers. A fair is held annually in the honour of the Swami at Mundargi, which is very largely attended, and at it the Swami feeds the visitors, and gives a money prize for proficiency in scholarships etc. His learning and charity have won him a large following even in other communities.

(3) "The Swami has given free of cost a portion of his Math, land to Govt. for the construction of the dispensary, Police lines, School and 'Town-hall' at Mundargi. He has also contributed about Rs 1500 for the construction of the dispensary building.

(4) "It is the wish of the large and influential bodies of his disciples, among whom there are Brahmins, Mahommedans, and other non-Lingayat classes, that he should be exempted from personal appearance in the Civil Courts as mark of Honour".

Endorsement by the District Judge, Dharwar, No 2207, dated the 12th August 1920.

Resolution:— The proposed exemption is sanctioned. The following notification should be published in the Bombay Government Gazette:—

"Governor in Council is pleased under the provisions of Sections 133 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 (V of 1908) to exempt Shri Jagat-Guru Annadani Swami of Mundargi, one of the chief Priests of the Lingayat Community in the Deccan, from personal appearance in Civil Courts"

2). The High Court should be informed as required by Section 133 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

Sd H. Wilber Force-Bell.
Deputy Secretary to the Government of Bombay,
Judicial department.

S.S.H.

Stamp

Government of Madras.

Courts :

Civil :- Exemption from personal appearance – Shri Jagat-Guru-Annadani-Swami of Mundargi. Sanctioned under Section 133 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

Law (General) Department.

G.O. No. 2998 Mis., Dated 21st July 1924.

Read the following paper :-

From the Karbhari of Shri Jagat-guru-Annadani Swami, Guru, dated nil

From the Govt of Bombay, Home department No 2998, B, dated 5th July 1924.

ORDER.

Under Section 133 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908, the Governor in the Council is pleased to exempt Shri Annadani Swami ~~Jagat~~ Guru of Mundargi, one of the chief priests of the Lingayat Community in the Deccan, from personal appearance in Civil Courts

(By Order of the Governor in Council)

Sd V T Krishna Acharyar.

Ag. Secretary to Government.

To,

Shri Jagat-guru Annadani Swami of Mundargi, Gadag Taluka, Dist Dharwar, Bombay Province.

The Honourable the Chief Justice.

The Superintendent Govt. press, for publication in the Gazette.

Copy to the Govt of Bombay, Home department.

Forwarded to the Jagat-guru Annadani Swami of Mundargi.

(By order) Sd. XXX

H

No. 1822/4.
Home Department:
Bombay Castle, 22nd June 1939.

Notification.

Under the provisions of Section 133 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, the Govt. of Bombay is pleased, to exempt Shri Jagat-Guru Annadana Swami, Guru Annadani Swami of Mundargi, a High Priest of the Lingayat Community in the Dharwar District, from personal appearance in Civil Courts, in the Province of Bombay.

(Civil procedure Code 1908 (Act V of 1908)).

By order of the Governor of Bombay.

J.M. Sladen.

Secretary to the Govt. of Bombay,
Home Department.

No. L.A.W. 321
Office of the Collector,
Dharwar, 28th June 1939.

Copy forwarded for Information to —

1) The Manager of the Shri Jagatguru - Annadani Swami, Guru Annadani Swami Muth, Mundargi w.c.
2) The Mahalkari Mundargi
3) The Prant Officer, III Division, Dharwar, w.c.

Sd- . x x x
for Collector of Dharwar.

O.C. Signed
by the Collr.

Copy of Order Passed by the District Magistrate Dharwar on the application Andaneppa Shri and 3 others of Mundargi regarding car festival of Shri Annadani Swami of Mundargi

---

Order Under Section 144 (5) C.P.C.

I have heard arguements on both sides and consider that as the management and Worshipers of the Holemath have taken out a car procession for many years without interference from the devotees of the Holemath, it is undesirable to forbid them to do so this year. There is no reason for any other person to interfere, and it is an established principle that so long as an individual or Community is acting in exercise of a general right and without prejudice to the rights of the rest of the Community that individual or Community is entitled to protection against interference.

I therefore cancel the order of the first Class Magistrate which is in my view un-necessary

2nd June 1926.

Sd. A. Master
District Magistrate.

Copy of application presented to the Collector & District Magistrate Dharwar by the Wat Mukhtiyar of Shri Tolad Mahaswamigalu of Gadag on 19-6-40 regarding the Cross palanquin procession of Shri Annadani Swami of Mundargi

To,
The Collector & D Magistrate,
Dharwar.

Respected Sir,

The application on behalf Shriman Niranjana Jagat guru, Tolad Shiddhlingayya Mahaswamigaluvaru Sansthan Math Dambal & Gadag is as follows.

1) It is learnt that a cross palanquin procession of one Annadanaswami of Mundargi is proposed to be celebrated at Mundargi, on or about the 11th july 1940 and a permission has been applied for in that behalf. This is to oppose that move and to request your honour to reject any such

application for permission .

2) The applicant is one of the few Arch Priests of the Lingayat - Community. The Swamis of this math are held in high esteem by the members of their Community. Although the principal Maths are situated at Dambal and Gadag. There are innumerable branches almost in every town all over the Karnatak, viz. in the presidencies of Bombay and Madras, and in the states of Mysore, Nizam, Ramdurg, Sangli, Miraj, Jamkhandi etc. There are several Inams given by the British as well as Pre-British Kings.. The Swamis of this math are held in high esteem by the British Government. The applicant is exempted under S. 100 of Act V of 1908) from personal appearance in Civil Courts. It is the special privilege of the Swamis of this math to be carried in a accompanying procession with the use Pancha Khalshas. Such a right is not available to other Swamis of the Lingayat Community except a few among whom Andana Swami M..argi is certainly not one.

(3) This Andana Math was originally a branch started by the predecessors, of the applicants Math. As the name itself indicates, it is a math where food was distributed in charity. The predecessors of the applicant used to maintain Annadana Math. They began to appoint their sub-ordinates as Annadana Swamis to look after Annadana Maths. Similarly the Annadana Math at Mundargi is one which was started by Totad Mahaswami gadi of Gadag, and as such was directly to the subordinate to the latter. It is the latter Swami that appointed the Annadana Swami for Mundargi Math. This point is conclusively decided by the High Court of Bombay in Special No. 277/1875 .

(4) As days passed the local Swami at Mundargi, began to gather, local influence and support

and gradually disown the over-lordship of the Jagatguru Mahaswami at Gadag. As the Annadanaswami thus began to assert his independence, the then Tontad Mahaswamigalu ejected the former from the Math. But he still managed to keep his hold on some of the properties of the Math without any right and [illegible] call himself the same name as Annadanaswami. Thus it is clear that the Annadanaswami whose cross palanquin procession is to be performed is not [illegible] the applicant. He is not an independent Swami, much less a Swami of any eminence. His claim to be carried in a cross-palanquin in [illegible] [illegible] is grotesque. He is not entitled to it.

5) This is not the first occasion when the Annadanaswami attempts to get the privilege of cross-palanquin in [illegible] It has been [illegible] his [illegible] and respected effort since over 3 or 2 decades to get the same. But on every occasion his attempt has met with a failure so far as the applicant could trace (within short space of time after coming to know the present move). The said present Annadana Swami predecessor (also called Andana Swami was prohibited from ~~enjoying~~ enjoying these privileges by the orders dated 9-9-12, passed by [illegible] Magistrate and Deputy Collector. By his order dated 9-8-13, the then District Magistrate and Collector, Mr. E. Maconochie, also, prohibited the Andana Swami from being carried in a cross palanquin (A certified copy of this is appended hereto) Andana Swami appealed to the Govt. against this order, but the appeal was rejected on 13-12'13. (Copy of order of G.D. No. 884 is appended)

(6) It is also learnt that Andana Swami regularly filed a civil suit on 277/1916 of Gadag Court for obtaining a declaration of his rights to enjoy the above said [illegible]

and that the same was dismissed. The matter was taken up to the High Court in Appeal No. $\frac{822}{1917}$ which was also dismissed. Under these circumstances, the said privileges cannot be claimed any longer for the said Andani Swami.

(7) Under such circumstances, the new assumption of such privileges by Andani Swami amounts to challange to the supermacy of the applicant, especially because at Mandargi there are two Andani Swami Maths, one owing allegiance to the applicant, and the other to the Andani Swami in question. The local Lingayat public of Mandargi is divided into two sections, one devoted to each of these two Maths. The enjoying of these previleges by Andani Swami will be resented by the followers of the applicant's Maths, and in all probability it may cause breach of public peace

⑧ The ~~[illegible]~~ applicant ordinarily resides at Gadag. He has no idea of the move of Andani Swami's Cross-Palanquin. Even Bhaktees of the applicant appear to have had no clue till very lately the sudden rumour that such a ceremony is being arranged has upset them. It is just likely that the organisers of the proposed ceremony might have concealed the above facts. If as a result of an such one sided enquiry permission is given, and it will enhance the dissentions of raising a fresh and long standing dispute. This may in all probability lead to grave disturbances of peace, as the disciples of the applicant abound in Mundargi and also in the villages round about the ~~village~~ place. In the interest of public peace and tranquility it is necessary that the one ceremony of carrying the Andani Swami in cross palanquin and of using the puncha Khalshes at that time be prohibited.

(9) As the matter is one of grave consequence, the applicant [illegible] to bring it to your honour's special

notice and desires that your honour will be pleased to prohibit the proposed procession in the best interest of the both the parties and also in the interest of the public peace and safety.

(10) It need not be repeated that the applicant's request is quite fair and legitimate, since the Andani Swami in question has never enjoyed the said previleges, while on the contrary every assertion of his rights has been met with a reversal. It has thus been several times held that he has no right to enjoy the previleges, under such circumstances, it is the first duty of the Magistrate to respect the established civil rights. From this point of view also, the proposed procession needs to be prohibited.

(11) As above stated the applicant does not yet know the ground or grounds on which the claims of the Andani Swami are sought to be established. If only he is permitted to know ~~them~~ them, he will see his way to prove them to be untenable.

For the fore-going reasons, it is prayed that the cross palanquin procession be dis-allowed forth with.

Dharwar
19-6-1940

Hoping to be obliged,

I remain
Sir,
Yours faithfully

Sd. ಶ್ರೀಮನ ನಿರಂಜನ ಜಗದ್ಗುರು ತೋಂಟದ [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

For and on behalf of Shriman Niranjana jagat-guru, Tontada, Siddhalingaya, Mahaswami galavaru of Dambal and Gadag

(Holder of Power of Attorney)

Sd.
S. S. Malimatti.
advocate

Sd.
V. G. Rotti
pleader

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]
1932
[illegible]
24

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

On the back page

Sd/Urdu | Sd/Urdu

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 311-4.

[illegible]

[illegible] عرض [illegible] داخل [illegible] کہ ایک [illegible] تعلق [illegible]

[illegible] خیرات انعام [illegible] تھا

اسی واسطے [illegible] مذکور [illegible] معزول کیا

[illegible] جناب [illegible] صاحب بہادر

نے [illegible] روانہ [illegible] حکم آیا [illegible]

[illegible] کی نقل کروا کر واسطے [illegible] روانہ [illegible]

آج یہ مسطورہ حال سید کا مکمل اور صاف ہوگئی [illegible]

تحریر چودہ رمضان سال ۱۲ دستخط

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 13-9-12 [illegible]

[illegible] 28-1-13 [illegible]

[illegible] 28-1-13 [illegible]

0-1-6 0-0-6 0-0-3 0-2-3

Sd/Konglesh
Mahalkari

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Before me

Mundargi
7/9/12

Sd/ H. Venkatrao
Dy. S.C

Sd/

True copy.
Mahalkari

[illegible]

[illegible] 134-12

[illegible]

[illegible] 28 1-13

[illegible] 24-1 13

[illegible]

Sd/ Uph...
Mahalkari

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Hundigi
7-9-12

Before me
Sd/ H. Venkatarao
~~Sd/ H.~~ Dept. S.C.

True copy
Exd. by
LC Sd/[illegible]

Sd/[illegible]
Mahalkari

[illegible]

13/9/12

28/1/13

[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
64	1-1-0	0-0-6	0-8-3.	0-1-9

Sd/[illegible]
Mahalkari

[illegible]

[illegible]

Before me
Sd. H. Venkatarao
Dept. S.C.

Hundigi
7-9.12

Compd. by
Sd/[illegible]

True copy
Sd/[illegible]
Mahalkari

[illegible] ⑧ [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

8) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 56

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

~~[illegible]~~ [illegible]

x x x

[illegible]

[illegible]

In answer to your [illegible] dated

I beg to ~~[illegible]~~ submit as under

I have made an application under s. 18 of the Bombay Public Trusts Act of 1950 in the Court of the [illegible] [illegible] Charity [illegible] [illegible] with [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] a public [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Trust [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] Act [illegible] public [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] which [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible]

is in the [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] The [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible] [illegible] enquiry [illegible] [illegible] a public trust [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the enquiry will [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] most [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] State [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] a public [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

of Bombay State,

[illegible] [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible] [illegible] the trust [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] shall [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Act [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] according to the Act. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible]

collected under the [illegible] Registration
Act of 1908 of the [illegible] [illegible]
the [illegible] of which such [illegible] is
[illegible] [illegible] Chairman.
A cost [illegible] of any
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] outside the [illegible] in the [illegible] Registers
the copy [illegible] [illegible] the subregistrar
[illegible] [illegible] the A [illegible]
[illegible] on

For all the relevant documents
and deeds which is proof of our
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] public trust are [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] the
[illegible] Chairman, [illegible]

I therefore [illegible] [illegible]
the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible], please
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] the A Ch [illegible]

To

The Collector and District Magistrate,

[illegible]

Subject : Cross Palanquin Ceremony of Mahanteswami of Mundargi.

Respected Sir,

In continuation of the application dated 9-6-1940, filed on behalf of the Shreeman Niranjana Jagadguru Tontad Mahaswami [illegible] Sansthan Math Dambal and Gadag, the Mat- Mokhatiyar has to state as follows :-

At the time of the last application above named, the applicant had no occasion to see the application made by or on behalf of the Mahanteswami of Mundargi, who claimed the right to be carried in cross -palanquin. Soon after the said application, an application was duly made to the Collector to get a copy of the application for permission made by or on behalf of the said Mahanteswami. It is to be regretted that no copy has been furnised as yet.

2. In the last application dated 9-6-1940, it is contended that the move for the cross-palanquin procession was kept concealed from the other party. Naturally, one section and a big section of the public was in dark and so, even the

police authorities and others, must have been carried away by the statements of the people belonging to one side only. Any order passed by your honour on such an one sided enquiry would lead to unfortunate results.

3. In the said application dated 19-6-1940 reference has been made to the judgments of the Civil Courts wherein it has been held that the Andaneswami has no right to be carried in a cross-palanquin. At the time of presenting the application, it was requested that an opportunity should be given to produce the copies of these judgments at the time of final hearing. No such opportunity was unfortunately given. The copies are produced herewith. They will show that Civil Court has held that the Andaneswami has not got the right which he claims.

4. It is learnt that since the matter came to the notice of the other side, many applications have been made by the Bhaktas of the Shriman Niranjan Jagadguru Kontad Swami against granting permission to Andaneswami. It is learnt that the proper enquiries have been now started by the local Magistrate and the Sub-Inspector of Kundargi. It is thus clear that a regular report is still to come from them. The reports so long received by your Honour are all one sided.

5. The order dated 7-7-1940 passed by your Honour either presumes that it is customary with Andaneswami to be carried in a cross-palanquin or it makes it a condition precedent that he should prove such a custom. The order dated 3-3-1913

passed by the then District Magistrate [illegible] [illegible] holds that the objection to [illegible] being to be set up recently. [illegible] similarly the [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] in [illegible] 77 of 19[illegible] also comes to the same conclusion. In the face of these, it is [illegible] on the part of [illegible] to set in that it is customary with him to be carried in a procession-[illegible] manner. He has never enjoyed such right. This is the first occasion. He should not be allowed to set up a new right.

6. As already stated in the [illegible] application the petitioner has no right, consequently the procession of his very [illegible] is likely to be contrary to the [illegible] into [illegible] civil and criminal courts and is likely to create commotion in the minds of the [illegible] of this applicant and in all probability may lead to a disturbance of public peace. In the interest of public peace and [illegible] I [illegible] that for the present the procession be stopped under Section 144 of Cr. P.C. It may be left to be done for the days [illegible] till and there [illegible] specially since a postponement is not likely to cause loss or hardship to the applicant.

Dated: 10th July [illegible].

To

The Collector & District Magistrate,
Dharwar District,
Dharwar.

Respected Sir,

The application on bhhalf of Shreeman Niranjan Jagadguru Totad Shidhalingarya Mahaswami-galavaru, Sansthan-Math Dambal and Gadag, is as follows :-

1. It is learnt that a Cross-Palanquin xxxx procession xxxx/ of oneAndanaswami of Mundargi, is proposed to be skxxxkx celebrated at Mundargi on or about the 11th July 1940 and a permission has been --- applied for in that behalf. This is to oppose that move and to request your honour to reject any such application for permission.

2. The applicant is one of the few Arch-priests of the Lingayat Community. The Swamis of his Math are held in high esteem by the members of the Community. Although the principal Maths are situated at Dambal and Gadag, there are innumerable branches in almost every town all over the Karnatak - Viz. in the Presidencies of Bombay and Madras, and in the States of Mysore, Nizam, Ramdurg, Sangli, Miraj, Jamkhandi etc. There are several Inams given by the British as well as --

pre-British Kings. The Swamis of this Math are -- held in hgih esteem by the British Government. The applicant is exempted (under section 133 of Act V of 1908) from personal appearance in Civil Courts. It is the special privilege of the Swamis of this Math to be carried in a cross-palonquin with the use of Pancha-Kalashas. Such a right is not availabl to other Swamis of the Lingayat Community except a few, among whom the Andana-Swami of Mundargi is certainly not one.

3. This Andana Math was originally a branch started by the predecessors of the Applicant's Math. As the name itself indicates, it is a Math where food was distributed in charity (Anna + dana). The predecessors of the applicant used to maintain -- several Annadana-Maths. They began to appoint -- their subordinates as Annadana-Swamis to look after these Annadana-Maths. Similarly the Annadana-Math at Mundargi is one which was started by the Totad Mahaswamigalavaru of Gadag and, as such, was directly subordinate to the latter. It is the latter Swami that appointed the Andanaswami for Mundargi Math. This point is concludevely decided by the High Court of Bombay in Special Appeal No. 277/1875.

4. As days passed, the local Swami at Mundargi, began to gather local influence and -- support and gradually disown the ~~swarkxxxxhip~~ over-lordship of the Jagadguru Mahaswami at Gadag. As the Andanaswami thus began to assert his indepen-dence, the then Totada Mahaswamigalavaru ejected the former from the Math. But he still managed to keep his hold ~~without any right~~, on some of ~~on~~ the properties of the Math without any right, and to call himself by the same name as Andanaswami. From this it is clear that that the Andanaswami whose

cross-palanquin ~~ceremony~~ procession is to be performed is but a desciple of the applicant. He is not an indepen-dent Swami, much less a Swami of any eminence. His claim to be carried in a cross-palanquin with Pancha Kalashas is grotesque. He is not entitled to it.

5. This is not the first occasion when the Andaniswami attempts to get the privileges of cross palanquin etc. It has been his persistent and -- repeated effort since over 2 or 3 decades to get the same. But on every occasion his attempt has -- met with a failure. So far as the applicant could trace (within short space of time, after coming to know of the present move), the said present Andaniswami's predecessor (also called Andaniswami was prohibited from enjoying these privileges by the order dated 9-9-1912 passed by the Sub Divisional Magistrate and Deputy Collector. By his -- order dated 9-8-1913, the then District Magistrate and Collector Mr. Maconochie, also prohibited the Andaniswami from being carried in cross-palanquin. (A certified copy of this order is appended -- hereto). Andaniswami appealed to the Government against this order; but the appeal was rejected on 13-12-1913. (copy [illegible]

6. It is also learnt that Andaniswami -- regularly filed a civil suit No. 272/1914 of Gadag Court for obtaining a declaration of his rights to enjoy the above said privileges and that the same was dismissed. -- The matter was taken up to the High Court in Appeal No. 522/1917, which was also dismissed. Under these circumstances, the said privileges cannot be claimed any longer for the said --- Andaniswami.

7. Under such circumstances, the new -- assumption of such privileges by Andaniswami

amounts to a challenge to the supremacy of the -- applicant - especially because, at Mundaggi there are two Andaniswami Maths, one owning allegiance to the applicant and the other to the Andaniswami in --- question. The local Lingayat public of Mundargi is divided into two sections, one devoted to each of the two Maths. The enjoying of these privileges by Andaniswami will be resented by the followers of the --- applicant's Math and in all probability, it may cause a breach of public peace.

8. The applicant ordinarily resides at Gadag. He had no idea of the move of Andaniswami's cross palanquin. Even the Bhaktas of the applicant appear to have had no clue till very lately. The sudden rumour that such a ceremony is being arranged has up-set them. It is just likely that the organisers of the proposed ceremony might have concealed the above facts. If as a result of such an one sided enquiry permission is given, it will enhance the dissentions by raising a-fresh a long-standing dispute. This may in all probability lead to grave disturbances of peace, as the desciples of this applicant abound in Mundargi and also in the villages round about that place. In the interest of public peace and tranquility, it is necessary that the one ceremony of carrying the Andaniswami in cross-palanquin and of using the Pancha Kalashas at that time be prohibited.

9. As the matter is one of grave consequence the applicant hastens to bring ~~x~~ it to your honour's special notice and desires that your honour will be pleased to prohibit the proposed procession in the best interest of both the parties and also in the interest of public peace and safety.

10. It need not be repeated that the applicant's request is quite fair and legitimate, since the Andaniswami / in question has never enjoyed the said privileges, while on the contrary every assertion of his rights has been met with a reversal. It has thus been several times held that he has no right to enjoy these privileges. Under such circumstances, it is the first duty of the Magistrates to respect established civil rights. From this point of view also, the proposed procession needs to be prohibited.

11. As above stated the applicant does not yet know the ground or grounds on which the claims of the Andaniswami are sought to be established. If only he is permitted to know them, he will see his way to prove them to be untenable.

For the foregoing reasons it is prayed that the cross-palanquin procession be disallowed forthwith.

Hoping to be obliged.

Dharwar)
19-6-1940 }

I remain,
Sir,
Yours faithfully,

For and on ~~bxxl~~ behalf of Shree
Niranjan
-ran/Jagadguru Totada Shidha
-lingayya Mahaswamigalavaru of
Dambal and Gadag.

(Holder of Power of Attorney).

Fifteenth

Copy was applied for by post on the 15th April 19[illegible].

Record Keeper.

(5580)

Rs	4	14	0
Com	0	13	0
P	0	2	0
	5	13	0

It was ready for delivery on the (23rd) April 19[illegible].
(Twentythird)

Record Keeper.

It was sent by post on the 24th of April 192
Twenty fourth

Record Keeper.

In the Court of the Civil Judge Dist. Dharwar.

At Dharwar. February [illegible] 1868.

No 560 of 1867

Pleader for appellant.
[illegible]rao
Vasudevrao.

Twatut Swamy Gooroo Twatut Swamy of Bellary by his general Agent Dod Sidlingswamy Gooroo Twatut Swamy) Appellant

Against.

Pleader for respondent.
Shreenivasrao
[illegible]rao
[illegible]
absent and not represented

Andanswamy Chanbasto Gooroo Twatut Swamy
[illegible] Gooroo Twatut Swamy) Respondent.

Claim Rs 22560-6-8.

This suit was instituted by Dod Sidling Swamy on behalf of Twatut Swamy who claimed a Math, lands and -- gardens attached situated in Mundargi Taluka Dambal. Also lands situated in [illegible] the full management of which had been entrusted to Andanswamy urf, Chanbasav Swamy -- deceased but he resigned the trust and plff sent two other disciples the defts to take charges and they falsely pretending they had been entrusted with full powers, assumed entire management and under date 1853 6th June refused to acknowledge pltff. The defts after this quarrelled and preferred charges against pltff in the criminal Courts which were disposed of February ~~July~~ 1857. Hence this action.

Mundargee.

Value of Math	16000
Lands attached	7505

Poleykerolands.

Fields	600
[illegible] ~~Revenues~~ Rs 14-15-2 X 10=149-[illegible]-4	

	24254-[illegible]-8

Pltff produces a document from deceased Andenaya dated 16th March 1851

The defence of Andenaya

1. My name is Andenaya Swamy Gooroo Andenaswamy and I am in full management and pltff has styled me incorrectly

2. Pltff constantly resides at Tanjal and cannot sue by general Agent.

3. The claim is opposed to Reg V of 1827 S 1 C 1. Pltff is not proprietor of the math, he has never managed and it has been in possession of my Guroo for many years

4. The claim is opposed to Reg 18 of 1826 S 16. The value of the Math is 25000 Rs and trees also are worth -- 1500 Rs X 10 = 15000.

5. The Sarv Enam lands and gardens are not the --- property of pltff, they were acquired by one Guroo and are entered in the public accounts in his name and we have the ~~he has~~ ever enjoyed them. Pltff never has done so.

6. The claim is fraudulent. Pltff holds lands maths in Bellary and Coykal as do we, but we are wholly unconnected.

7. Pltff has no sort of claim to the [illegible] ~~revenues~~

8. The document produced by pltff is a forgery --- Andenaswamy did not write it nor had he authority to do so and pltff's examination before the Revenue Courts will ---

fifteenth

Copy was applied for by post on the 15th April 1926.

Record Keeper.

(2580)

Cd? 4-14-0

Com 0-13-0

f 0-2-0

5-13-0

It was ready for delivery on the (23rd) April 1926.

(Twenty third)

Record Keeper.

It was sent by post on the 24th of April 1926

Twenty fourth

Record Keeper.

In the court of the Civil Judge Dist Dharwar.

At Dharwar. January 28th 1868.

No 360 of 18[illegible]7

Pleader for appellant.

Eshwantrao
Wasdevrao.

Twatut Swamy Gooroo Twatut Swamy of Bellary by his general Agent Dod Shidlingmuree Guroo Twatut Swamy) Appellant

Against.

Pleader for respondent.
Shreenivasrao
Huchrao
Patad Varee
absent and not
represented

Andanya Charantee Gooroo Twatut Swamy
Putreemuree Guroo Twatut Swamy) Respondent.

Claim Rs 22560-6-8.

9

This suit was instituted by Dod Shidling Muree on behalf of Twatut Swamy who claimed a Math, lands and -- gardens attached situated in Mundargi Taluka Dambal. Also lands situated in Huleckeri the full management of which had been entrusted to Andanswamy urph, Chanbasav-Swamy -- deceased but he resigned the trust and pltff sent two other disciples the defts to take charges and they falsely pretending they had been entrusted with full powers, assumed entire management and under date 1853 6th June refused to acknowledge plff. The defts after this quarrelled and preferred charges against plff in the criminal Courts which were disposed of February ~~July~~ 1857. Hence this action.

Mundargee.

Value of Math	16000
Lands attached	7505

Huleekere lands.

Fields	600
Vrossums ~~Revenues~~ Rs 14-15-2 X 10	=149-7-8
	24254-7-8

Plff produces a document from deceased Andaneya dated 16th March 1851

The defence of Andaneya

1. My name is Andaneya Swamy Gooroo Andanyswamy and I am in full managements and plff has styled me incorrectly

2. Plff constantly resides at Dambal and cannot sue by general Agent.

3. The claim is opposed to Reg V of 1827 S 1 C 1. Plff is not proprietor of the math, he has never managed and it has been in possession of my Guroo for many years

4. The claim is opposed to Reg 18 of 1827/S 16. The value of the Math is 25000 Rs and trees also are worth -- 1500 Rs X 10 = 15000.

5. The sarv Fram lands and gardens are not the --- property of plff, they were acquired by one Guroo and are entered in the public accounts in his name and we have ~~as heir~~ ever enjoyed them. Plff never has done so.

6. The claim is fraudulent. Plff holds lands maths in Bellary and Copbal as do we, but we are wholly unconnected.

7. Plff has no sort of claim to the rossums ~~revenues~~

8. The document produced by plff is a forgery --- Andanswamy did not write it nor had he authority to do so and plff's examination before the Revenue Courts will ---

prove the forgery nor does the document apply to the claim

9. Patree Maree deft No 2 is a servant of plff and has been fraudulently made a party to this suit. he is not in possession of any portion of the claim.

The defence of Patree Maree

I have not offered any opposition to the claim and should not have been made a party to the suit. The P.S. Amin at Dharwar laid down the following issues.

1. Plff sues by general attorney is he a resident of Tambal or of foreign territory

2. Is claim undervalued

3. Is deft properly denominated

4. Plff to prove his proprietory title and that defts were nominated by him. Defts to disprove and show their -- title and determined.

1. Totswamy is not a resident of any particular -- territory as ruled S.A. No. 2210 dated 23rd March 1847-- (p 68 Bellasis Reports)

2. Claim is not undervalued.

3. Deft is Andanswamy

4. Claim rejected with costs of deft No 1

Deft No 2 to bear his own costs.

Totat Swamy by his agent Dod Shidling Maree --- appeals on the grounds.

1. The decree is against evidence and respondents admissions.

2. Respondent No 1 is not Andanya Swamy but Andanya Chamantee.

By Court. How is it that Twatat Swamy ~~appended~~ appointed Andan-Swami if the Maths are distinct

~~Swamirw.~~ Shreeniwas. Twatat Swamy had this power. It is like the case of the Peshwas who were supposed not to be ~~compared~~ confi until approved by Raja at ~~Pallard~~ Satara but the Raja had no real power.

By Court. The two cases are not parallelwho selected nominee for approval of Twatat Swamy.

~~Swamirao~~ Shreenivas. The chief deciples of four or five maths -- selected the successor who was installed or conscerated plf by Twatat Swamy but when once ceremony was completed Twatat Swamy could not remove the nominee nor had he any power -- over the math.

By Court. But how came Twatat Swamy to possess this power.

Shreenivasrao. He is a high priest and same custom -- prevails amongst Brahmins.

Eshwantrao. See Ex No 61 in which Andanya admitted -- that for 3 or 4 years Narogeri Shidlinga a desciple performed service until he was appointed by Twatat Swamy.

By court. This ~~matter~~ rather confirms the explanation.

Eshwantrao. No, because Shidling Maree was a deciple of Twatat Swamy.

By court. But explain why the math and lands are registered in name of Andanya Swamy wahiwatdar Twatat Swamy

Eshwantrao. That means Andaneya is mear agent of --- Twatat Swamy

Shreenivas. Then why are some lands in name of Andany Swamy alone.

By court. Is Patree Maree name of an office of the Math

~~Shivarao~~ Shreenivas. Yes. The leaves necessary to Lingayat worship are collected by a deciple who is called Patree Maree and his family name is lost.

By court. Then why has Shidling Maree retained his -- name.

Shreenivasrao. He may not have had any special duties

By court. The court understood you to mean that on becoming a deciple the family name was merged in the brotherhood or religious order.

By court. All desciples call themselves as Shidling Gooru Twatat Swamy. So what is the object of ~~allering~~ altering Guroo into gomashta in Ex 48. So far back as 1770.

Shreenivas/That is a petition or order on a petition from Peshwa.

Wasdevrao. Totya as head priest would never have --- called Andanya Guroo how could he the word Shish would -- have been employed.

Proceedings closed for the day.

Sd/ H Shaw

Judge.

January 29 1868.

Hearing resumed this day.

Counsel as before.

By court. How did it happen that Shidlingmaree acted so long.

~~Swamirao~~ Shreenivas. Andany Swamy became mad and Shidling a -- Maree acted until the heads of caste in different villages assemble and selected successor.

By court. But suppose Totad Swamy refused to confirm the selection of that assembly

Shreenivas. The appointment would still hold good.

Wasdevrao. To show how incorrect this advice is See Ex No 61.

By court. Ex No 48 shows that the Tot Swamy has been quarrelling with the Andany Swamy since 1770 A.D. How then can you come into court your plaint being dated 90 years afterwards.

Wasdevrao. The dispute has not been continuous and when the inquiry was instituted before the Inam Committee. Andanya remained silent.

By court. What was result of inquiry under Ex No 48.

Wasudevrao. That Andany Swamy admitted the superiority of Tot Swamy.

By court. But you offer no proof.

Wasdev. Yes. The ~~Revenues~~ Russooms were paid to Tot Swamy.

Shreenivas. Yes. But the Collector ordered the ~~Revenue~~ Russooms to be paid to whom they were due and the Mamlatdar paid to Tot Swamy see Ex No 63.

By court. But what steps did you take to rectify that mistake.

Shreenivas. My client was not then appointed Patdaya dead Andanaya Swamy then managed.

By court. If your client is independent of the Tot-Swamy. Why did he pay Rs 500 and 300 as per ex No 61.

Shreenivas. It is a common arrangement to pay Ratho-Ochav expenses.

By court. Yes, but the court asked why he allowed -- 500 and 300 Rs to be taken instead of the 40 Rs agreed

Shreenivas. It was a voluntary offering.

By court. The tone of ex No 61 scarcely leads the -- court to suppose that these offerings were voluntary.

By court. What is the use of the Karar filed with -- plaint if the quarrel of 1770 was not continuous.

Eshwantrao. Andanya left the math and it was obtained from him during the inter regnum.

Shreenivas. The quarrel was before the Magistrate's courts from 1863 to 1867 and this Karar was not produced at those enquiries and it was not registered until January 1860. The value of this Karar is therefore apparent.

The court has to consider,

1. Whether the claim is barred by law relating to limitation.

2. If it is not, whether appellant has proved his claims to the Mundargee Math and lands attached thereto -- situated in Mundargee and Vallikeri.

No other issues sought by either side.

The court has carefully considered the arguments of counsel and has endeavored to understand the evidence to be collected from the mass of useless information recorded and the following appears to be the real state of the case.

The Mundargee Math under a swamy called Andanya as one witness says because it is his duty to dispense "An" and "Dhan" grain, is subordinate to a higher Math presided over by a Swamy called Twatat because he resided in a Tota or garden.

The subordination is shown by the numerous records in which Andanya is registered as the Wahivatdar of -- Twatat Swamy and Exs Nos 66,67,68,69 which prove that other rent free lands held by Andany Swamy are to be resumed by the state on the death of the then Twatat Swamy and therefore there can be no doubt but that at one time the Mundargee Math was completely under the control of the Swamy at Copbal called "Twatat". But it is shown that in 1770 A.D. the Swamy Andanya had usurped some of the powers of the -- Twatat Swamy see Ex No 48 and there is no evidence to show taht Twatat Swamy ever regained his lost position ex No 44 dated 1797 is an arrangement to pay certain monies by --- Twatat Swamy . Shree Andanya and another to other parties and the position of shree Andanya Swamy herein is certainly that of an equal of Twatat Swamy Ex No 50 is a mere acknowledgment of spiritual superiority which is not denied even now.

It is not very clear how the parties to this -- suit treated each other until 1853, but the Andany Swamy who in that year presided over the Mundargee Math, seems to have become insane and the math was left to the care of the Maree Shidling. The Twatat Swamy taking advantage of the interregnum came down upon the Math and he may have -- gained over this man, but as soon as respondent No 1 was appointed "Andany Swamy" he resisted the authority of the Twatat Swamy and the dispute was carried into the Police courts and there was prolonged until 1857 nearly four years during the whole of the time Ex No 1 the karar was not --- produced and that document and ex No 48 are not trustworthy The word Gomasta is a plain alteration of the word "Guru"

Sheristadar

and it is on these two unreliable documents that the claim is mainly based.

The court cannot find that Twatat Swamy has since 1770 up to date of plaint 1860 ever directly managed the Math and lands attached as set forth in the plaint and even during the period of Andanva's insanity when there was no Swamy Twatat Swamy did not take the proceeds of these -- lands but was obliged to leave them in custody of Shidling Maree. Whether Twatat Swamy or the Ayas of different villag Maths selected the present Swamy to be Andany is of little moment, it is evident that the Twatat Swamy had no more -- real control over the selected nominee than a dean and -- chapter possess when a couge A.Elire is issued recommending a person as beshop. Andany Swamy respondent No 1 and Twatat Swamy appellant are merely representatives of their respective orders and both are equally bound by the acts of their predecessors. Twatat Swamy therefore has no right to bring this claim and it is declared barred by the law relating to limitations Regulation V of 1827 Sec 1 clause 1.

The Principal Sadr Ameen will be called upon to explain the delay in disposal of this suit which as at present advised the court deems wholly inexecusable.

It is needless to argue the other issue and for these reasons the court confirms the decree of the Lower court and rejects the claim of Twatat Swamy to the Math and lands attached situated in Mundargee, and the lands situated in Vallakaree and Pogns. Costs upon Twatat Swamy.

Sd/Chas. F.H. Shaw.

J U D G E.

Typed by

C K Patil

Compared by

Karkun.

" True Copy "

Sheristedar.

Argument on behalf of Shri Jagadguru Totadswami of Gadag that Annadanswami of Mundargi should not be allowed to go in procession seated in cross palanquin with Pancha Kalasa.

....

A detailed inquiry was held in this respect by your worthy predecessor, Mr. H. Maconochie, and an order prohibiting Annadanaswami from enjoying these rights has been passed by him on 9-8-1913.

It is a well considered order and I beg to adopt it as my arugment in this case, so a copy of it is attached herewith. Annadanaswmi's appeal to the Government on this order has been rejected: a copy of that also is attached herewith.

Annadanaswami Math is a subordinate to that of Totadswami. This fact has been established in dispute which went up to the High Court: vide Special appeal No. 277 of 1875 referred to in the order of Mr. Maconochie. The desciples of Shri Jagadguru Totadaswami will resent the assumption of thos privileges by Annadanswami. Hence there is every likelihood of the breach of public peace. In the l but two papers of the order referred to above Mr. Machonochie says " It would be directly contrary to the interest of the public or and peace to admit it (privilege) in the case of every Math that choos to cut itself off from the present institution.

The principal points are 3:

1. The privilege of Pancha Kalasa and cross palanquin are enjoyed by Swamis of Maths of unquestionable preeminence.

Totadswami Math belongs to that order and Totadswami's right to enjoy these privileges hasbeen considered and admitted by the Collector and District Magistrate in his order of the 14th May 1903.

2. Annadanaswami Math is not a Math of that position but it is subordinate to that of Totadswami; and Annadanaswami has not enjoyed the right previously.

The assumption of these privileges by Annadanaswami is a challenge to the supremacy of Totadswami and will ~~cux~~ cause breach of the public peace.

It was on the score of these points, that Annadanaswami hasbeen prohibited from enjoying these privileges by the District ~~Magistrate~~ Deputy Collector & Divisonal Magistrate in his order passed on 9-9-1912, and by the Collector and District Magistrate, Mr. Maconochie, in his order passed on 9-8-1913 and Annadanaswami's appeal to the Government on the order of the District Magistrate was rejected on 13-12-1913.

His Civil Suit in this repsect went up to the High Court and was decided against him.

Cnoly two years back the 1st Class Magistrate of Gadag prohibited Annadanaswami from taking out a cross palanquin procession and with Pancha Kalasa.

He is persistently making applications in that is respect and all of them are rejected.

Now to / explain the prospective positions held by the Todadswami and Annadanswami;

I will give a short history of the original of Annadanswamis. Annadana Math means a Math where food is given in charity(a free boarding house). Totadswamis of old maintained many such Math. Totadswamis recently began the practice of appointing Annadanswamis to look after these Annadana Maths. Annadanaswami is always appointed by Totadswami. This point is set at rest by the decision of the High Court of Bombay in its special appeal No. 277/1875. Wherein it has been held that the tennure upon which the Annadanswami held lands was such that Todadswami was entitled to resume possession of them at pleasure. Ex. 46 in the said appeal shows that Totddswamis were masters of the Annadana Maths long before there were any Andanswamis. Ex. 50 in it which is a letter written by several Swamis, including Annadanaswami is in clear acknowledgment of Totadswami's supremacy. This case arose out of a dispute in which the predecessor of the present Annadanswami denied the overlorship of ~~the~~ Totadswami and tried to assume independence and ended in ejecting him from the old Annadana Math at Mundargi. The present Math of Annadanaswami at Mundargi is built quite recently.

In dismissing Annadanaswami's suit No. 277/1914, for delcaration of his rights to enjoy the privileges in question, the learned Sub Judge has decided the privileges of cross palanquin and Pancha Kalasa are special privileges enjoyable by High Priests of the Hindu Religion, like Totadswami and cannot be claimed by upstarts like Annadanaswamis. The concluding words of his judgment are " The streets are public no doubt; but they are not to be used for tresspassing on the rights of the Arch-priests of the Hindus, who alone are entitled to go in a cross palanquin with its parapheralia and not their subordinates and desciples like the plaintiff (Annadanaswami) nor members of the public at large.

Under these circumstances there are good grounds to hold that the assumtions of these -- privileges by the Annadanaswami will be resented by the followers of Totadswami, who are to be to found ineach and every village of this part of the -- Karnatik and will be a cause for the breach of -- public peace.

In the village of Venkatapur Totadswami has got a Math and a field and there are followers of him in that village as also in villages surround-ing it. The report now sent by the Police is one sided, the desciples of Totadswami have not been heard. District Magistrate has once prohibited the Annadnaswami in this respect and that order has been uphold by Government. So it is requested that Annada-naswami ~~in this respect and that order~~ should again be prohibited from using Panch Kalasa and cross palanquin.

Annadanaswami is persistently making applications through his men each year since 1919, this has become a reguler nuisance to Totadswami to oppose him each time. So it is requested that Local Government may be moved to take action under section 144 (G) to issue permanent order of prohibition to Annadanaswami and his desciples.

An application had been made for a copy of Mr. Maconochie's orders but a reply has been sent that it cannot be found, a copy of a certified copy of it is kept so also as regards the Government order.

In the Court of the Collector & District Magistrate,
Dharwar.

List of papers put in by the applicant.

Description	Date	
1. Copy of the copy of the order of Dist. Magistrate prohibiting Annadanaswami from using cross palanquin and Pancha Kalasa.	9-8-1913.	Copy had been applied for but not obtained so copy of the copy is kept.
1. Copy of the copy of Govt. order confirming the -- above order of Dist. Magistrate.		
1. Certified copy of High Court judgment in Appeal No.277/1875.	6-12-1876	
1. Copy of D.D.C's order.	9-9-1913.	
1. Certified copy of the order of 1st Cl. Magistrate Gadag prohibiting Annadanaswami from using cross palanquin & Pancha Kalasa.		
1. Private Copy of Sub, Judge Gadag Suit No.277/1914.	26-1-1919	As there no time to get a certified copy printed copy is produced.
1. Certified copy of judgment of High Court in Appeal No.832/1917.	11-8-1920.	

Report of the Kanarese application
of the villagers of
villages in
Mundargi
Petha.

To

The Collector & District Magistrate
Dharwar.

That Annadanaswami who is really and is decided to be desciple and subordinate of Jagadgu Totadswami in High Court appeal No. 277/1875 should not be allowed to take out a procession of cross palanquin with Pancha Kalasa.

That his applications for same have been rejected by D.D.C. in 427 D/ 9-9-12 D.M. on 9-8-13 and the appeal against. Government has also confirmed it. He has also failed in Civil suits for the same and recently by the 1st Class Magistrate Gadag on 20-3-1931.

Inspite of all these orders his attempt to get permission for cross palanquin is with the -- intention of breaking public peace.

So it is earnestly prayed that ~~A~~ Annadana-swami should be ~~prohibitx~~ prohibited from taking out procession of cross palanquin with Pancha Kalasa in any part of the Petha.

In the Court of the District Magistrate
Dharwar

Applicant :- Shreeman Niranjan [illegible] Jagadguru
[illegible] Sri [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible]
Sri [illegible] Math Dharwad [illegible]
~~by his [illegible] Khadyar~~

Vs.

Opponent: Annadana Swamy [illegible] Madanna
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Mundargi
Taluka Gadag

Application under Sec 144 Cr.P.C.

The applicant abovenamed most respectfully begs to submit as below:-

1) The applicant is one of the few High Priests or Jagadgurus of the Lingayat Community. The principal math being situate at Chitradurga, it has a great number of branches in many towns & cities of Karnatak viz in the provinces of

[illegible] long [illegible] and in the Native States of Mysore, Hyderabad [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] this much has been (and is) the [illegible] British [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] have [illegible] held in [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] The [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] Code

It is the object of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] belonging to the [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] is established by long [illegible] recognised by the British [illegible] [illegible] The applicant has all this privilege as will be apparent from the following narration of facts.

2) The applicant is not an [illegible] stranger at all. His [illegible] is only ~~[illegible]~~ a creation by Summons of the [illegible] applicant made. In fact it was nothing else than [illegible] where food was [illegible] in a [illegible] (Anant Ram) on the [illegible] [illegible], by the presence of the applicant [illegible],

Copy applied for on 23/11/20
Copy ready on 27/11/20
Copy delivered or ~~sent by~~ F.P. on 29/11/20

Dluwash
A.G. Assistant Sheristedar

Paper charges
0—0—4.
Pies four only.

Sectioner Jnr. K.S. Halkar 0-15-0
Examiner " V.V. Nagarkar 0-3-9
Reader " Y.S. Joshi 1-2-9
Rupee one, annas two and pies nine only.
(fo. 7½)

27-11-20

In the High Court of Judicature at Bombay.
Wednesday the 11th day of August 1920.
Appeal No. 822 of 1917 from Appellate Decree.

Shreeman Niranjan Jagadguru Andaniswami Guru Andaniswami Sansthan-Math Mundargi by his Vatmuktiar Solbaya Mahalingaya (Original Plaintiff) — Appellant

versus.

1, Totadswami Guru Totadswami; 2, Totaya Andanaya Mangluri; 3, Sangayya Channaya Shatter; 4, Mariyeya Sangaya Shantgeri; 5, Totaya Adiveya Gandhada, ~~6, Adiveppa Totappa Shakodi; 7, Basappa Mallappa Baligar~~; 8, Andanappa Kaulpati. (Original Defendants) — Respondents

× Struck off vide Court's order on the fard dated 12/8/19

Claim — Rs. 10 — for both purposes.

The Plaintiff sued for an injunction restraining the defendants from obstructing him in going in a cross palanquin procession with a panch Kulas and Birudavali on Vaishakh

Sudh 10 and 11, on Ashwin Sudh 10, and in
the beginning of Margashirsha in —
Mandarigi and elsewhere at other times
and prayed for costs.

The Original suit No. 277 of 1914,
was decided by the Subordinate Judge
of Gadag, who dismissed it with costs.

The Appeal No. 53 of 1916, of the District
File was decided by the District Judge of
Dharwar who dismissed it with costs.

An appeal has been admitted in the
High Court from the decision of the lower
ourt. Notice was ordered to issue by
he Honourable Mr. Justice Shah on
he 15th day of January 1918.

The grounds of objection to the decision —
ppealed against are:—

1. The lower Court was wrong in holding
hat the suit, filed by the Appellant, —
does not lie."

2. The lower court committed an error
law in its in not following the clear —
uling of this Honourable court, on this
oint, reported in I.L.R. 34 Bom. page 571.

3. It ought to have ~~been~~ held that —
every member of the public and every
ect has the right to use the public
treets in the lawful manner"
nd ought to have given the reliefs prayed for.

4.

4. The lower Court has entirely misunderstood the rulings reported in most of the cases cited in its judgment.

5. The lower Court has wrongly understood the Plaintiff's cause of action.

6. The securing by the Respondent-defendant of an illegal order from a Magistrate from using the public street in a lawful manner ought to have been held as a sufficient cause of action.

7. The lower Court has ignored the recent Privy Council ruling on the point.

8. The lower Court was wrong in not expunging the unnecessary, irrelevant and extremely offensive remarks made by the Subordinate Judge against the religious head of an important Community.

On 24th September 1917 the High Court sent down the case to the lower Appellate court for recording its finding on issues Nos 1, 2, 5, 6 and 8 framed by the trial Court. The lower Court certified its finding on 6th December 1919.

The Appellant above-named begs to urge the following objections to the findings of the lower Court.

1. The finding on issue No. 1 is bad in law. (Vide 42 Mad. F. B. p. 271)

2. The finding on issue II is opposed to the Privy Council ruling reported in 3

Moore's Indian Appeals.

3. The finding on issue V is bad for the same reason as the finding on issue II.

(Coram: Macleod C.J. and Fawcett J.)

For the reasons given in the accompanying judgment, the Court confirms the decree of the lower Appellate Court and dismisses the appeal with costs.

11th August 1920.

(Sd) N. D. Gharda
Registrar.

Bill of costs in the High Court.

By the Appellant—	Rs. A. P.
Stamp for memorandum of Second Appeal	0-12-0
Stamps for copies of Decrees & Judgments	1-8-0
Stamp for Vakalatnama	2-0-0
Bhatta for Process	1-0-0
Sectioner's Fee	0-13-0
Vakil's Fee	0-4-9
Printing charge	2-12-0
	Total Rs. 19-1-9

By the Respondents nos 1 to 5 & 8—	
Stamp for Vakalatnama	2-0-0
Vakil's Fee	0-4-9
Cost at the trial of issue sent down	0-8-0
	Total Rs. 2-12-9

Seal (Sd) M. A. Randelia
Sealer
The 11th day of August 1920.

(Sd) N. D. Gharde
Registrar.

True copy
Deputy Registrar

Sealer
The 27th day of November 1920

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 15-12-[illegible]

(1) [illegible]

(2) [illegible]

3) [illegible]

(4) [illegible]

(5) [illegible] 17 10-134

(6). [illegible]

(7). [illegible]

(8) [illegible]

14

(9) [illegible]

10) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

THREE

GOVERNMENT OF M
COPY STAM

COURT FEE
FOUR ANNAS
INDIA
4AS

COURT FEE
FOUR ANNAS
INDIA
4AS

[illegible]

[illegible] Survey Number:-

Copy of the [illegible]
1 Revision Survey number and Sub division
2 old Survey [illegible]
3 Government (G); or Inam (I)
4 Dry (D), wet (W), [illegible]
if wet, source of irrigation and class
5 for double crop, rate of consolidated [illegible]
6 [illegible]
7 Taram
8 [illegible]
9 [illegible]
10 [illegible]
11 [illegible] Pattadar or Mirasdar
12 Remarks

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

A. A. A. C. R. A.

136 .. D 136 . Ry. D .. 7-1 3 1 2 2 20 2 8 45 [illegible]

[illegible]

138 .... A.. 138. Ry. D... 7-1 3 1 2 0 57 0 12 45 [illegible]

[illegible]

139 ...... 139. Ry D .. 7-1 3. 1. 2 5 85. 6.. 9.. 45 [illegible]

[illegible]

140 ...... 140.. Ry. D .. 7-1 3. 1 2 4. 46 5... 0 45 [illegible]

~~141 141 Ry D 7-1 3. 1. 2 3 30. 3 11~~ [illegible]

141 ...... 141 ... Ry. D .. 7-1. 3 1 2 3 30.. 3... 11. .45. [illegible]

[illegible]

True Copy

for Tahsildar

Copied by S. [illegible]
compared by P. Basavanagowd
Correction ... nil
Words 150

7-4-41

.15

क्र सं 30
16-1-69

Addl. Judge Small Cause Court
O.S. 4073/68

D. II

B.P. Ghosh
30-7-56

15th ... Feb 1927
twentyfifth
Record Keeper

Copy was ready for delivery on 3rd day of March 27
third
Record Keeper

Copy was delivered (sent by post) on 4th day of March 27
fourth
Record Keeper

57c
Cop. - 13 6
Comp. - 3-0
P - - 6
1-1-0

[illegible]

[illegible] 139

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] — [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

- [illegible] -

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] —

.16

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] — [illegible] —

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

మబు బ్రగురు నల్లు లం లోని! అరుంతు మోంరు
విం వ లు ద్దాంల్ లవరు మబు బ్రగురునల్లు గ [illegible]
విశ్ మబు బ్రగురు నల్లు లవిసలత్తి బరు వవు
లోలంచు ద్రాము నల్లు లవిలనలురు నల్లు మ
బ్రగురు లా విమరుండు నరు. లోలంచు [illegible]
బయ్యు నమున్ ~~[illegible]~~ మబు బ్రగురునల్లు [illegible]
లు ద్దావ్! మబు బ్రగురు నల్లుల్ లువిధనల
గ్ ప్యి. ప్రుబెగనద్దురు నల్లు ప్పుల వస్టుల్గంరు
విన వ వరు లు అనేనుల న న్పుంప లవనవగనల్లు
ల్లా. లు మలావవన్ మబు బ్రగురు నల్లు లుల్లా
వం లంబు ప్రాం లల్లి వచ్చుంచ్చు మబు బ్రగుర
నల్లు లు రుల్లాల్ ప్యాం ల రుంటివలం చ్చుల్లా
గ్ ప్యరుంతుల్ల్ లవవన్ విగద్దురు లంలాల్
లల్ల్ లవరు విన ద్దురు నల్లు లు ౩ వినద్దుర
నల్లు లుద్దబన్ల్ [illegible] ద్రావ్ లుద్దబన్ల్ నన
గలం లవ ల్లా: వం విన లంగా నద్దూలు నల్లు లోలం
వన్నా-విలంతు గ్ ప్యరు లుద్దలు లంలంచ్చు
లల్లి: న లు వి నలా వి నల్లు గ్ ప్యి ద్దావం లనన్
లజరుని వెగద్దురునల్లున్ లద్ద విలవినద్దు

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] —

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

6/6/16

Sd/ H.V. Kane
Sub Judge

on 25th day of Feb 1927
(Twenty fifth)

3 day of ~~Feb~~ March 1927

4 day of ~~Feb~~ March 1927

470.

Cop 0-11-3.
Comp 0-2-6
P 0-0-6
0-14-3

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

.17.

చరిత్రలు.

౧౯౦౭.

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

5/1/16.

Sd. A. V. Kane
Sub-Inspr

PREPARED BY

Karkun.

TRUE COPY

[illegible]

by post

25th February 1925

(Twenty fifth) [illegible]

3rd March 1925

[illegible] [illegible]

4 March 1925

[illegible] [illegible]

277/14

[illegible] 470

[illegible]

[illegible] 1925

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

·18

[illegible]
[illegible]

Cross:-

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

6-1-16 Sd/ H.V. Kane
Subjudge.

[illegible]

COMPARED

TRUE COPY

by post
25th
twenty fifth

Feb. 27

3 March 1927
Record Keeper.

4 March 1927
Record Keeper

570

Rs. 0-13-6
Comp. 0-3-0
Pap. 0-0-6
1-1-0

[illegible]

[illegible] నంబరు 139

[illegible] నంబరు [illegible]

నా పేరు [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ముఖ్య ప్రశ్నలు

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] ಮತ್ತು ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಬಂದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅಡ್ಡಪಾಲ್ಕಿ ಉತ್ಸವ

ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎನೆ ಉತ್ತರಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಜ

ಗದ್ಗುರು ನಾವೇ ಎಂದು ಅಡ್ಡಪಾಲ್ಕಿ ಸತ್ಕಾರ ಇದೆ ನಾವು.

ಕುಂದಗೋಳದಲ್ಲಿ [illegible] ನಮ್ಮ ಊರಲ್ಲಿ ನೂರ

ಎರಡರ ಒಪ್ಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಮದುಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗೆ ಅಡ್ಡಪಾಲ್ಕಿ ಹಾಕ್ಲಿ

[illegible] ಬರುವದಿಲ್ಲ. ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗದ

ಮುರುಘ ಮಠದ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ವ ಮೂರುಸಾವಿರ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರು

ಅವರಿಗೆ ಜಗದ್ಗುರು ಎಂತಲೇ ಅಡ್ಡಪಾಲ್ಕಿ ಸತ್ಕಾರ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ

ಮೂವರ ಹಿಂದವರ ಮಠದವರು ಎಂದವರಿಗೆ ಸತ್ಕಾರ ಇಲ್ಲ.

೭೯೩೮.

ತೋಂಟದ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಜಗದ್ಗುರು ಎಂಬಂತೆ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಕಾಲದ

ಕಡೆಯಿಂದಾ ಬಂದರ ಪಟ್ಟ ಅವರ ಮನೆದು [illegible]).

ಗುರುಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಮುಟ್ಟಿದೆ

ನಾವು ಸೋಲಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಜಗದ್ಗುರು ಎಂದು ಮನದು ಹೊಂದಿರುವ

ರು ನಿಷ್ಠರು ಮುರುಘಾದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಜಗದ್ಗುರುಗಳು ಹಿಂದ

ನ ಒಂದಾನ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳಿಗೆ ತೋಂಟದ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಚರಂತಿಗೆ ಕೊ,

ಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾದಿ ತೋಂಟದ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಶಿಷ್ಯ ಉಂಟಲ್ಲ.

ಮುಖ್ಯ ಗುರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಚರಂತಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಚರಂತಿಗೆ

ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅವರು ಅಂದಿನವರ ಗುರುಗಳಾದರು. ಅವರಿಗೆ ನಾವು

[illegible]

[illegible] ముఖ్య

[illegible]

ముఖ్య గురువులు [illegible] ముఖ్య గురువులు [illegible]

[illegible]

వీరభద్రస్వాములవారి [illegible] గురువులు ముఖ్య

గురువులు [illegible] వీరభద్రస్వామి [illegible]

ముఖ్య గురువులు [illegible] ముఖ్య గురువులకు

[illegible]

3 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] ముఖ్య గురువులు [illegible]

[illegible] ముఖ్య గురువులు [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] వీరభద్రస్వాముల [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Sd/ H. V. Rane

Sub-Judge

6-6-16

TRUE COPY

Superintendent

COPIED BY

COMPARED BY

Examiner

on 25th day of Feb 1927
(Twenty fifth)

Record Keeper.

3 day of ~~Feb~~ March 1927

Third

(sent by post) on 4th March ~~Feb~~ 27

Fourth

470

Copy 0-11-3
[illegible] 0-2-6
P 0-0-6
0-14-3

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

20 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] ———

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

వ్రా: కె. [illegible]

5/1/16. Sd. H. V. Kane
Sub-Judge

COPIED BY

1 anna

[illegible] BY

[illegible]

TRUE COPY

Sheristadar.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

౧ [illegible]

౨ [illegible]

౩ [illegible]

౪ [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1 [illegible]

[illegible]

([illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]

6
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

౧౧౮

([illegible]

[illegible]

౧ [illegible]

[illegible]

౨ [illegible]

౩ [illegible]

౪ [illegible]

౫ [illegible]

[illegible]

౬ [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

౧౦ [illegible]

౧౧ [illegible]

౧౨ [illegible]

౧౩ [illegible]

౧౪ [illegible]

౧౫ [illegible]

౧౬ [illegible]

౧౭ [illegible]

౧౮ [illegible]

౧౯ [illegible]

౨౦ [illegible]

౨౧ [illegible]

[illegible]

౧౩౦

[illegible]

౧౬౮

౪౮౧

[illegible]

౧ [illegible]

[illegible]

౧ [illegible]

[illegible]

(౧౦) [illegible]

(అ) [illegible]

(ఆ) [illegible]

(౩) [illegible]

([illegible]) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

order

I have found that the value of the property in litigation is over 5000 Rs. & that is the value for purposes of jurisdiction in mearly declaratory such as held i 12. Madras - 223 (vide Ex 97).

This Court has therefore no jurisdic to try this case.

The plaint is therefore returned to be presented to the proper Court under order 7 Rule 10 C.P.C.

The plaint was presented on 21-11-1908 by Mr Godkhindi and it was returne to him to day the 5th September 1910

Sd/ H. V. Chenmulgund.
Sub-Judge,

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

X X [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]

నం
౧౧౦

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 201 [illegible]
1914

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1914 [illegible]

By pleader for pltff [illegible]

[illegible]/10 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Cross examination [illegible] the plaintiff
for the 2nd defendant

[illegible] (1) [illegible] (2) [illegible] (7) [illegible] (4) [illegible] (10) [illegible] (11) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 11000 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 11 5 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

([illegible])

[illegible] ——

[illegible] 2ನೆ [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] ——

[illegible]

[illegible] —— [illegible]

([illegible])

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

([illegible])

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 22

[illegible] ——

[illegible] ——

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] ——

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

([illegible])

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]

No. of 1918.

From ,

Shrinanmaharaj Niranjan Jagatguru Charsarva-
bhaum Tontadarya Mahaswamigalavar Sausten --
nath , Dambal by their Vatmakhtyar Gound
Devaru Guru Totadswami of Gadag.

To ,

The Karbhari ,

Ramdurga State ,

RAMDURG.

Gadag 29th May 1918.

Sir ,

I have the honour to request you to kindly supply me with certified copies of the following as early as - possible.

(1) " Copy of Register No 1 of 1868 of Rivision Survey No 30 acres 9/25 , assessment Rs 10 . profit Rs 14/4 Joodi 4/12 at Chikop. "

(2) Copy of Inam Register Do - - Do --

The said land is in our vahiwat and in our khata.

The copies may kindly be sent by V.P.P which I will arrange to receive.

I have the honour to be ,

Sir ,

Your most obedient servant ,

Vatmaktyar.

~~[illegible]~~

~~[illegible]~~

~~[illegible]~~

~~[illegible]~~

[illegible]

~~[illegible]~~

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] సింహాసన [illegible]

[illegible] —

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] [redacted] [illegible]

[illegible] [redacted] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

No.P.O.L.S.R. 771
Office of the District Magistrate,
Dharwar, 10-11-1941.

From

The District Magistrate,
Dharwar.

To

B.M.Patil, Esquire,
Gadag.

Sir,

With reference to your application dated 13-10-41 requesting for the return of the certified copies of the documents produced by you in the Court of the District Magistrate, Dharwar, I have the honour to return herewith the documents, the receipts of which may kindly be ~~xxkxx~~ acknowledged.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

for District Magistrate, Dharwar

PRK.

702 Regd. A.D. PC

26

Copy was applied for by post on the 15th April 192.. fifteenth

COURT FEE
INDIA
13-8-1940
EIGHT ANNAS
8 As

Record Keeper.

12.001

cop. 2-7-0
com 0-6-6
p. 0-1-6
2-15-0

It was ready for delivery on the (23rd) April 1926.
(Twenty third)

Record Keeper.

It was sent by post on the 24th of April 1926
Twenty fourth

Record Keeper.

In the court of the District Judge of Dharwar

At Dharwar the 19th April 1875.

Appeal No 360 of 1867.

Pleader for appellant Swamirao and Shankrapa	Twatat Swamy Guroo Twatat Swamy by his general Agent Dod-Shidling Muree Gooroo Twatat Swami. (plff).	Appellant.
	Vs.	
Pleader for respondent. Shreenivasrao and Soobrao	1. (T O R N) Gooru Twatat Swamy and	Respondents.
No 2 absent.	2. Patree Maree Guru Twatat Swamy	(defts)

Claim Rs 22560-6-9.

The particulars of this claim appear in former minutes of the court

JUDGMENT.

19th April 1875.

Appeal No 360 of 1867.

The decree in this case was reversed by the High court Sp Ap No 329 of 1868 and the case remanded for retrial on the following issues.

Sheristedar.

1. Whether the terms upon which the math was held by the deft Andanya Swamy was such that the plff was entitled to resume the possession of it at his pleasure.

2. Whether the appointment of the deft 1 was complete and he was entitled by virtue of his office to the possession of the math?

These were referred by the acting Judge under Sec 354 with a third issue as to whether this decision was barred by limitation and the 1st class Sub Judge of Dharwar has found that (1) the terms upon which the Math was held by deft Andanya was such that plff was entitled to resume possession of it at his pleasure.

(2) that the application of deft was complete and that deft holds possession subject to the orders of the plf but that he is not entitled by virtue of his office to possession of the Math.

(3) That the claim is not barred

My finding on the two issues framed by the High court is strictly in accordance with the finding of the 1st class Sub Judge given above.

The third issue referred by my predecessor is unnecessary regard being had to the judgment of the High court in remand.

The claim is shortly for the recovery of a Math at Mundargee Taluka Dambal and also for certain lands.

The answer of the deft is that plff has no title and never had the management of the property.

The evidence on either side is very voluminous. The witnesses for the plff state that the Twatat Swamy is owner of the Math and its endowments and that in his capacity as spiritual lord and master he duly consecrated and invested the deft Andanya with the emblems of office at Dambal. The contentions on the deft's side is, that Andanya was consecrated at the above place by several Charmoorteas or cilibate priests of whom the plff was one and that the right of ownership rests solely in the person so appointed

Sheristedar.

The witnesses for the deft however differ in many particulars and are not to be depended on. While those on the -- plff's side depose in a consistent and satisfactory manner proving the complete subordination of the deft as officiating priest of the Math at Mundargee to the plff. his --- ecclesiastical superior at Copbal. The case for the plff also receives strong corroboration from the deposition of the deft Andanya before the Maha~~ntswamy~~-lkari of Dambal in March 1853 in which he clearly admits the authority of the plff (No 61). Another very important document is the Ex No 50 which is deposed to by the witnesses 181 and 132 and was passed in A.D. 1802 by the Ayas of several Maths including the predecessor of deft to plff expressive of their submission and obedience to him This paper was further produced in the Rev Court in 1340, and was returned by the late Sadar Dewanee Adalat in 1843

There are two other documents exs 1 and 48 the former purporting to have been executed by Andanya to plff on the 15th March 1853, and the latter bearing date as far back as A.D. 1770 and containing an order from a superior officer of the former Govt to the Kamavisdar of Kopbal regarding the Mundargee Math. Although the question of title was not and could not be investigated in the Police Courts it is nevertheless strange that then two papers were not even attended to by plff when he was accused by deft of - having forcibly entered the math and committed theft. The witnesses 197-200 depose that Andanya was in perfect possession of his senses when he made over his office to plff and signed the ex No 1 and wrote a document is also alluded to as having been passed on stamped paper by Andanya shortly before his death by the Patil and Kulkarni of Mantwad in their depositions dated 16th December 1863 (Ex 271) Unfortunately however the plff in his statement (No 15) before the Mahalkari on ~~the~~ 31st May 1853 admitted the insanity of Andanya and on the ground alone serious doubt attached to the Ex

Sheristadar.

No 1- it not being clear whether Andanya's understanding was completly impaired or whether he had lucid intervals during which he might have resigned his appointment as -- disciple in charge of the Mundargee Math. As regards the Ex No 48 two witnesses 174,175 aver that the writing and seal are similar to other documents of a like nature. There is however an evident alteration in this paper which is not explained the word Guroo or spiritual guide. having been changed to Gumastha or Agent. This may have occured through inadvertence or mistake on the part of the scribe who originally drew up the document or it may have been done by the plff/ with the object of furthering his claim. The word --- Gumastha is certainly more in convenience with the content than Gooru the purport of the order being that the Kamavisdar should warn Andanya to render implicit obedience to the Twatat Swamy as formerly. The sense of the letter being thus clearly in plff's favour the substitution if caused by him must have been effected from an anxious fear lest the term gooru should operate to his disadvantage. The --- alteration is unfortunate as a doubt is thus cast on a -- document which would have otherwise had a very important bearing on the plff's claim.

The Ex No 64 contains the plff's receipt for money drawn from the Govt treasury in 1845 on account of allowances due to the Gooru Twatat Swamy and his disciple Andanya in connection with the Math at Mundargee and had the deft Andanya been wholly independent of plff, the money would never have been disbursed to the latter alone, who was --- evidently recognised by the Revenue authorities as the -- proprietor of the Math. In various other official papers also the plff is entered as owner and the deft Andanya as his Agent or manager and the order of the Inam Commissioner No 66 is to the effect that certain lands belonging to the Math and standing in the name of the plff, Twatat Swamy -- are to be resumed by Govt on his death, no notice or mention

Sheristedar.

whatever being made of Andanya. In conclusion I hold that even setting aside the exhibits No 1 and 48 the plff has presented a strong case, to rebut which the defts have -- adduced nothing of a cojent nature; and I therefore reverse the decree of the Principal Sadar Ameen of Dharwar dated 5th September 1867 and allow the claim of the plff Twatat Swami. Costs of plff as the deft; Andanya and Tatree Naree to have his own costs.

Sd/W.Sandwith.

Judge.

Typed by

C.H. Patil

Compared by

Karkun.

" True Copy "

Sheristedar.

Presented by L. Swamy [illegible] for application 14/8/940.

K 150.
Patwardhan
103

Copy applied for on 19/5/1913
ready on 4/6/1913
~~delivered on~~ 5/6/1913
V.P.P. on

COURT FEE
EIGHT ANNAS
INDIA 8As

E. Alvares
Assistant Sheristedar.

Machine charges Rs.0-2-0
0-2-0

Amount two Annas only to be credited to Govt.
4/6/13

Section Mr. Kale Rs 0-15-0
Examiner Patwardhan 0-5-0
Copier Talikar 0-5-0
Dr. Talks 1-4-0
Rupee one and annas four only
4/6/13

Judgment in Special Appeal No.277 of 1875.

Andana Swami Guru Andana Swami

(Original Defendant) Appellant.

Versus

Totada Swami Guru Totada Swami.

(Original Plaintiff) Respondent.

Special Appeal from the decision of the Judge of Dharwar in Appeal No.360 of 1867.

This being a Special appeal, this Court cannot reverse th findings of the District Judge on the issues of fact directed by the late Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Gibbs, when this cause was remanded on the 6th July 1869 by the High Court for retrial, unles there be an error in law or in the investigation of the case, whic has produced error or defect in the decision of it upon the merit as for instance a total absence of evidence in support of the fin -ings of fact.

It has been argued for the first Defendant(Appellant) that there is not any evidence to support the finding that the tenure upon which the Andana Math is held, by the first Defendant was such that the Plaintiff was entitled to resume possession of it at his pleasure; and it has been further argued that the District Judge has overlooked the fact that in the Sanads(Exhibits No.114 and No.115) the Defendant is named as Inamdar, and, therefore, that there has been an error in the investigation of the case.

We find it quite impossible to say that there is no evidence to support the finding of the first issue on fact - as much regards the tenure by which the Defendant held the Math and as to the right of the Plaintiff to resume it.

Exhibit 46(dated in the Shake year ~~86~~ 1638 and Christian year 1716) though it relates to lands in another village, shows that the Totada Swami was then described as master of the Andana

Math, apparently long before there were any Andana Swamis. Thirteen witnesses (Nos. 153, 154, 162, 167, 177, 181, 182, 186, 192, 195, 196, 202 and 204) depose to the ownership of Plaintiff and to his spiritual and temporal supremacy. Exhibit No.50 signed by numerous Swamis, including (as third on the list) the Andana Swami, is a clear acknowledgment of at least his spiritual supremacy. The resumption of the Andana Math by the Plaintiff on the occurrence of the lunacy of the first Defendant's immediate predecessor, and the administration thereof for four years by the Totada Swami were acts strongly indicative of supreme temporal and spiritual authority. The lunacy and resumption occurred in A.D. 1844, at which time the Defendant was a disciple of the Plaintiff resident in the Math. The Defendant was nominated to the office of Andana Swami in 1849, by the Plaintiff, although the Defendant has asserted, but has failed to prove that he was elected to that office by other persons. Again in Exhibits Nos. 71, 72 (dated in 1861) 73 and 74 (dated in 1862) which are Sanads, granted by the British Government, of lands, which it is admitted are appendant to the Andana Math, the lands are described as held by the Andana Swami as Vyvatdar (corruptly Whywatdar) of the Totada Swami. The learned Counsel for the first Defendant contends that the opposite is the case, but grammatically the word Vyvatdar should follow and not precede the name of the person described as manager. So we have no doubt that the District Judge has rightly understood those documents. It is true that the lands mentioned in them are not the lands in dispute, but being as they are, lands appurtenant to the Andana Math, although not in the same village with it, the inference is strong that the Andana Swami was merely the representative and agent of the Totada Swami in holding those lands. It is true that the District Judge has not mentioned the circumstance that the lands in dispute as stated in two Sanads (Exh. 114 and 115) of 1862 as held by the Andana Swami. But we cannot thence infer that he overlooked that fact. Were we to lay it down as a general rule that whenever a District Judge omits to mention a particular item of evidence of more or less importance — he must be regarded as having left it out of his consideration scarcely any decree brought up here on special appeal could be sustained under such an ordeal. Moreover the fact that lands stand in a particular name in the Government books or in Government ~~records~~ Sanads,

41

though always of some importance, is far from being conclusive as to the ownership of the lands, as experience of many years has aught us here. And the weight of Exhibits 114 and 115 is, and was probably regarded by the District Judge as, much diminished by the circumstance, adverted to by him, in the last paragraph but two of his judgment that in the "Official papers" viz. the sanads already mentioned as Exhibits 71,72,73 and 74 lands admitted to be appurtenant to the Andana Math, but situate in another village, are described as managed by the Andana Swami for the Totada Swami. For these reasons we cannot say that there was not any evidence to support the finding of the District Judge that the tenure of the Math by the first Defendant Andana Swami was such that the Plaintiff was entitled to resume the Math, and secondly that though the first Defendant's appointment as Andana Swami was complete, he is not entitled by virtue of his office to resume possession of the Math — the latter part of which finding or the second issue seems to follow on the finding up on the first issue. We also are unable to say that although the District Judge has not specially mentioned Exhibits 114 and 115 he must be regarded as not having taken them into his consideration and therefore committed an error in the investigation of the case. Holding these views, it is unnecessary for us to notice the facts of this case at any greater length. The decrees of the Courts below must be affirmed with costs.

Sd/M.R.Westropp

26th September 1876.

Sd/Nanabhai Haridas.

True Copy

A.B.Ghardai

Deputy Registrar.

A.B.Ghardai

Sealer

hardai

The 6th day of June 1915.

874

Copy applied for on 19th September 1912

Copy prepared on. 30th September 1912

Copy sent by post on. 4th October 1912

For Commissioner, S.D.

COURT FEE
INDIA
[illegible]
13-8-1940
EIGHT ANNAS
8 As

No P/115 of 1910

28th May 1910.

Number of words.
90
Copying fee 0-2-0
Comparing fee 0-0-6
paper cost 0-0-3
Total. 0-2-9

Order on the petition of the followers of Shri Niranjan Jagadguru -

Shri-man Niranjan Jagadguru Tolad Swami Sansthan Math Dambal-Gadag has been permitted to pass in cross palanquin with the Panch Kalas and other insignia of his office as spiritual guru of the Lingayet Community in all places within the Southern Division. All Collectors and District Magistrates are

requested to see that the exercise
' the said right by the said Swami
s not interfered with by anybody,

opied by,
ardas Khan

Compared

Sd/ W. C. Gibb
Commissioner S.D

True copy,

For Commissioner S.D.

[illegible]

Read Police Inspector, Gadag Circle's vernacular No.# 427 dated 8th. Instant.

Heard S. Vinekar for Shri Totadswamy and Mr. Venkatrao Arur for Shri Annadanaswamy.

....

The word procession in this office No.P.A.1046 of 7th. Instant was used in its ordinary sense, and it does not give any permission to Shri Annadanaswamy to do anything in excess of his rights or against customs or in interference with the procession of Shri Totadswamy. No mention of any cross palanquin or Pancha Kalasa has been made in the application made to this .... office on the 7th. Instant on behalf of Shri Annadanaswami. If the followers of Shri Annadanaswami want to have a simple ..... procession without any cross palanquin and Pancha Kalasa they may have it in accordance with the orders of the Assistant .... Superintendent of Police (No.1455 dated 7th. Instant).

It has been contended for Shri Totadswami that Shri Annadanaswami has no right to go in a cross palanquin with Pancha Kalasa and that the High Court has decided that the latter is a disciple of the former. There are orders of the Commissioner S.D. and District Magistrate, Dharwar, in force which allow Shri Totadswami the right to go in a cross palanquin with Panch Kalasa and other insignia of his office in all places of the Southern Division (Commissioner S.D's No.P/415 dated 28th july 1910). No such order has been shown to be in existence in favour of Shri Annadanaswami and he has failed to show that it is customary for him to exercise the right to which Shri Totadswami has been held to be entitled.

A disturbance of the public tranquility is apprehended and there is very little time left to make detailed enquiries. The local Police have already directed the followers of Shri Annadanaswami not to go in procession with cross palanquin and Panch Kalasa for to day.

I affirm this order and in exercise of powers under section 144 Criminal Proceedure Code, direct Shri Annadanaswami and his followers at Mundargi to abstain from going out in ..

in procession with a cross palnquin and Panch Kalasa. It will of course be open to Shri Anadanaswami to get an order from the proper authorities in same way as Shri Totadswami has done.

Dharwar
9th. September 1912.

Sd./ V.K.Namjoshi.
Sub Divisional Magistrate, F. C.
III Division, Dharwar.

....

No.2220 of 1912.
Dharwar 9th. September 1912

Copy with compliments forwarded to the

Sd/
SubDivisional Magistrate F.C.
III Bivision, Dharwar.

The District Magistrate, Dharwar.
The Assistant Superintendent of Police, Dharwar.
The Police Inspector, Gadag Circle (with two spare copies for publication at Mundargi).
The Mahalkari and Magistrate, Second Class, Mundargi.
Shri Annadanaswami of Mundargi.
Shri Totadswami of Gadag.
Ishwarappa Pompanna & other followers of Shri Annadanaswami of Mundargi.

14/5/1945

INDIA 8AS
COURT FEE EIGHT ANNAS

Copy applied for by Shrimant Maharaj Niranjan Jagadguru Tontad Mariguru Siddhaswamy of Mutt Mukhya Tontad Mariguru Siddhaswamy Samstan Math Dambal of Gadag Taluka on 27-10-1915

It was ready for delivery on 16-11-15

It was delivered on

No. of words	Copying fee	Comp. fee	Paper charges	Total
1320	1-10-6	0-7-0	0-1-9	~~1-15-0~~ 2-3-3

for Collector of Dharwar

Order passed by the District Magistrate Dharwar on 9-8-15 regarding claim of Annadaniswamy of Mundargi to go in procession with adapalki and Panch Kalasa.

Order

In this case the question at issue is the correctness or otherwise of the claim put forward by the Annadaniswamy of Gadag to be carried in cross palanquin with the insignia of Panch Kalasa and the effect of the finding n that issue as regards the District Magistrate's duty with espect to s 44 of the Bombay istrict Police Act, and s 144 f the Criminal Procedure Code

2 the claim of the Annadanaswamy is contested by the Totad swamy of Gadag who asserts his spiritual and temporal superiority over the former and egards the exercise of the right laimed as derogatory to his own ordship. The right of the Totad wamy to go in procession with ross-palanquin and panchkalasa as been considered and admitted y the Collector and District agistrate in his order of the 4th May 1903 Mr Gibb found that e practice had been continuous or more than half a century and

practically unopposed. In that case the opponents were the representatives of the Shringeri Swamy the chief spiritual head of the Smartha community. The dispute then was between the followers of two different religions. In the present case it is between the followers of two mutts belonging to the same religion and so the question that I have to consider are as follows

(1) Is there satisfactory evidence that the right claimed by the [illegible] swamy has been exercised unopposed for a substantial period?

(2) If the exercise of the right claimed is permitted now is there danger of obstruction or annoyance to the public or of a disturbance

of the public tranquillity.

I find on the first issue in the negative and on the second in the affirmative, for the following reasons

3 Eight witnesses of respectability and also independence were produced before me at Innadaroy who said that they had seen the Annadani Swamy going in cross palanquin for periods varying from 20 to 30 years. On the other hand Mr Venkatrao Narasingrao Nadgouda the representative of the leading Desai family of that part of the country and a Sardar of the Deccan states that the practice dates from 1907 only at which time the Annadani Swamy instituted a jatra of his own. There is

absolutely no documentary

evidence as to the exercise of the right at any time up to the last year or so when the followers of the Tolad swamy took objection to the proceeding. The evidence of the [illegible] above mentioned is entitled on the face of it to consideration. On the other hand due allowance must be made for the esteem in which the present Annadani-Swamiyes undoubtedly and to the best of my knowledge deservedly held in Mundaragi & the neighbourhood and the natural tendency to exalt a respected local dignitary. Considering the relations existing between the two maths as [illegible] by documentary evidence, I am unable in the absence of the clearest proof of the [illegible] to believe that the Totadswamy is [illegible] to have permitted the right claimed to e exercised for the number f years alleged without protest. ne Vikuntrao's account is onsistent both with admitted facts and probabilities. The popularity and influence of the Annadan Swamy Math are a recent growth and it is natural that with the increase of funds and the institution of the new patra, he ceremonies attending the rogress of the Swamy should e elaborated. I hold therefore hat the alleged practice is of ecent institution and not of long Standing

4. Coming to the second issue he significance of cross palan-uin and punch Kalasa must e considered. The privilege

of being carried in a palanquin cross ways is one that so far as my knowledge goes is enjoyed only by swamys of maths of unquestioned preeminence In Mysore the practice has varied at different times but at present it is admitted in the case of the Jagadguru of Shringeri alone In British India practice is not so strict and the general tendency of judicial rulings is to maintain the rights of different sects to make such use as they like of the public streets provided that they do not thereby invade the rights of property enjoyed by others, or cause a public nuisance or interfere with the ordinary use of the streets by the public Where there is precedent for the use of a palki the privilege has in which the Annadani-Swamy styles himself with respect to the Tolada-Swamy "your obedient Annadani Swamy". Coming to more recent times, a khata standing in the name of the last Annadani swamy was continued after his death in the same name. The Tolada swamy obtained an heirship certificate and got his name — substituted. An application was made to get the certificate cancelled but it was rejected by the 1st class Sub-Judge Dharwar.

The Annadani swamy then filed a suit for change of khata but withdrew it last year; another suit with respect to the Manchkinal Math is still pending. It is not within my province to decide whether the Tolada swamy is or is not the spiritual and ~~[illegible]~~ temporal

superior of the Arunadan swami.
What I am concerned with is the question
whether the followers of the former
have good reason to believe that
he is, and to resent the assumption
by the latter of privileges implying
his equality to an extent that is
likely to cause a disturbance
of the public tranquillity. In my
opinion the question must be
answered in the affirmative.

15. It has been argued by Counsel
that whatever the case may have
been once, the Arunadan swamy
is now independent and is
at liberty to assume the insignia
of supremacy. Further it has
been urged that the followers of
the Arunadan swamy greatly
outnumber the followers of the Fotad
swamy in Inundangi and
that if they entered to carry their
swamy

sitting in cross palanquin may have every right in view of judicial rulings, to do so. I am unable to accept either argument. The practice of cross palanquin is in its very nature the cause of ~~the~~ public obstruction and of interference with the ordinary use of the streets by the public. It is a direct assertion of supremacy so far as the particular sect is concerned and a challenge to those of that sect who deny it. Where it has the sanction of long usage it may be admitted but it would be directly contrary to the interests of public order and ~~place~~ peace to admit it in the case of every math that chooses to cut itself off from the present institution. So far as Mudaragi itself is concerned there is some force in the second argument.

but if the right were admitted in Mundaragi it would be claimed elsewhere and the followers of the two swamys would be liable to come into conflict wherever they are to be found living in the same place.

6. There is nothing to prevent the Annadaneswamy going in procession in his palanquin carried in the ordinary manner and without the peculiar palanquin but for the reasons given above if preparations are made to use cross palanquin and the insignia specified it will be necessary to issue orders under s.144 of the ~~Indian~~ Criminal Procedure Code or s.44 of the Bombay District Police Act.

7. It appears that each year a

new Anandan swamy appointed by the Totad swamy was carried in cross palanquin. This will not be permitted in future. The previlege attaches to the Totad swamy personally & if it is prohibited in the case of the swamy of the old Anandan math, the prohibition must apply equally to any person newly appointed by the Totad swamy.

Dharwar
9/8/13

Sd/- E Maconochie
District Magistrate

"True copy"

For Collector of Dharwar

presented by
L B Dongre
for the applicant
L B Dongre

Copy applied for by Totadmariguru Totadswami of Gadag vat Moktiyar to Shriman Mahaswami Samsthan Math Dambal and Gadag, on 3rd. September 1914.

It was ready for delivery of 1st October 1914.

It was delivered on 2nd. October 1914.

No. of Words	Copying fee	Paper charges	Comparing fee	Total
130	0/3/0	0/0/3	0/1/0	0/4/3

Sd.

for Collector Dharwar.

No. 8811

Judicial Department.

Bombay Castle 13th December 1913.

To,

Mr. Channa Basavayya Fakirayya Hungirimath and
other residents of Mundargi,
Dharwar.

Memorandum.

With reference to their memorial, dated the 6th October 1913, appealing against the order passed by the ...... District Magistrate Dharwar on the 9th August 1913, in which he intimated that, if preparations were made to carry the ..... Annadan Swami of Gadag in a palanquin borne cross-wise or with the insignia of panch kalasa, orders would be issued under section 144 of the Code of Criminal Proceedure 1898 or Section 44 of the Bombay District Police Act, 1890. Mr. Chann Basavayya Fakirayya Hungirimath and others are informed that after.. .. careful consideration Government see no reason to interfere in the matter.

Sd/ A. F. Kindersley.

Under Secretary to Government.

"True Copy."

Sd/

For Collector, Dharwar.

examined by

[illegible]

[illegible]

14/8/1920

Proceedings under section 144 Criminal Procedure Code held by the [illegible] Divisional Magistrate, First Class, III Division, Dharwar.

INDIA 8As COURT FEE EIGHT ANNAS

Read correspondence beginning from the Assistant Superintendent of Police, [illegible] No.1699 of 6th September 1913 and -- ending with his endorsement No.3325 dated 20th April last.

2. It appears that for some time past, disputes have arisen between the [illegible] and [illegible] over questions of temporal and ~~[illegible]~~ spiritual Supremacy ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible]. In the month of Shravan of the last Hindu year, a separate [illegible] regarding certain Bhajans to be performed in that month. The [illegible] II Class [illegible] apprehended a breach of peace and prohibited both the [illegible] from performing any [illegible].

3. The occasion [illegible] the Assistant Superintendent of Police, [illegible], considered that it would be in the interests of public peace, as the question of the [illegible] to be performed in the month of Shravan was [illegible] before next occasion arose.

4. The [illegible] were accordingly informed by the Undersigned by a notice that they might consider the advisability of settling their dispute amicably out of or through Court. In pursuance of that notice the [illegible] of the two [illegible] have appeared to put in their written statements. A fresh occasion has now arisen for this year's Bhajans [illegible] to be performed this month.

5. The statements show that the [illegible] are mutually cautious not to bind themselves to any statement that [illegible] on their part of the contested questions, but [illegible] concurred on the following points viz:-

(1) The Shravan Bhajans may be performed by both [illegible].,

(2) but that it should be performed not in the same [illegible], but in two different [illegible].

(3) The [illegible] to begin his [illegible].,

(4) The [illegible] up the fourth [illegible] to begin his.,

(5) Both agree as to the line on which the Bhajans are to be [illegible]

(d) These lines are laid down in the written statements put i

O R D E R .

7. It is hereby ordered:-

(1) That the Uchava of the Shree Totad Swami should begin this year on the third Monday in the month of Shravan, which falls on 10th Proximo, on the general lines as laid down below and as agreed to by both the contending parties:-

(a) On the morning of Monday the 10th Proximo, the image of the Shree Chidheswar God be seated in a palanquin with all the insignia including Panch Kalas and the palanquin should leave the Math and be carried, if they like, across e, by Channadevar house, Yelluravar and Shettar shops, Bazars, the grain market, the Mahal Kacheri and go on the Panchlingan ~~[illegible]~~ Gaddi on the bank of Tungbhadra and -- return in the afternoon by the same route.

(b) On Tuesday (11-8-14) morning the Kriya Murti to be taken to the house of Kubasad var and thence taken back to the Math before 9 a.m., by the Hale Bazar, Kankangouder well, Grain market, Shettar and Yelluravar shops.

(c) In the afternoon of the same day the Shree Totad Swami of Gadag will go in procession in cross palanquin with all the insignia including Pach Kalas.

(d) On Wednesday the 12th the Shree Totad Swami will go to Dambal in procession with all his insignia.

(2) The Uchava of the Shree Andani Swami should begin on the fourth Monday in Shravan which falls on ~~[illegible]~~ 17th Proximo and should follow the general lines laid down below:-

(a) On Monday morning (~~10~~ 17th-8-14) the image of Shree Chidheswar God be seated in a palanquin with all the insignia including Panch Kalas. The Procession to start from the Math and go by the Hos-Bazar, Chavadi, Vithoba's temple, and the Mahal Kacheri and go to the Panchlingan ~~Gudi~~ Gaddi and to return to the Math the same evening, taking Gadag road and passing in front of the Hanmant temple near Dod Agasi, Hale Bazar, Pyatiavar street, Histapana shop, Mon-Bazar. The Palanquin may be carried cross-wise if they chose. [illegible]

(b) On the early morning of Tuesday the Ariya Murti will be taken in procession to the house of Virupax Shettar in the Hale Bazar in a palanquin carried in the ordinary manner. The procession will return to the Math passing Sidharamesh shop and the Mon-Bazar.

(3) It is to be ~~[illegible]~~ noted that the cross palanquin and the Panch Kalas are allowed when only the image of three Sidheshwar is seated in the palanquin, and also when the Murgh Loted ~~[illegible]~~ Swami of Murug personally sits in the palanquin. The District Magistrate has in his order dated 5th August 1919 decided that "the privilege attaches to the Loted Swami personally" and it is therefore clear that the Ariya Murtis of neither Swami have that privilege nor has the Shree Andani Swami himself as decided by the District Magistrate.

(4) On behalf of the Shree Andani Swami it is submitted that during the whole of Shravana it is usual for the devotees to invite the Ariya Murti to their houses on any day convenient to them and that if an occasion to go to some devotees' house arises during the days allotted to the Shree [illegible] Swami they should be allowed to carry the Ariya Murti in a palanquin in a procession. Their request is inoffensive in form, but I am not sure, that there-in does not lie the germ of a possible breach of peace. From the ~~[illegible]~~ discussion that followed on this point, in Court, between the contending parties, I am satisfied that the feelings still run very high; so high that any slightest cause is likely to offend one another and I therefore do not think it safe in the interests of public peace, to leave any loophole, however small or inoffensive it may seem to be, which is likely to endanger the public peace, which it is the very object of that order to ---

preserve. I therefore order that neither the Shree [illegible] band nor ~~not~~ the three [illegible] shall be allowed to arrange any procession or carry their or ~~their~~ the [illegible] in [illegible] language, ~~after~~ without obtaining the written permission of the Mamlatdar and Magistrate, II Class, at least three days before the date of such intended procession, the Mamlatdar and Magistrate, II Class should not give such ~~permit~~, unless he finds it absolutely necessary and also without considering the objections of the other party and also without consulting the highest Police officer present on the spot.

5. A copy of this order should be served on the Wahivatdar of the two [illegible] and copies should also be forwarded to the Mamlatdar and Magistrate II Class, Mundargi for information and guidance.

The Sub Inspector of Police, Mundargi, for information and making the necessary Police arrangements to carry out the above orders.

The Assistant Superintendent of Police, with compliments, for his information.

(Sd) [illegible],

Dharwar, Sub Divisional Magistrate, I Class

25th July 1914. III Division.

No. [illegible] of 1914.

Dharwar, [illegible] July 1914.

True copy.

Sub Divl Magte III Div

To,

The Wahivatdar of Shri [illegible] of [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

11/6/1970

4180
7-14-0
2-0-0
0-3-0
10-1-0

Applicant was asked to deposit Rs 6/- more on 25/6/40 & Rs 6/- were produced on 27/6/40 & hence [illegible]

COURT FEE
[illegible] 13-8-1940
EIGHT ANNAS
INDIA
8AS

22nd June 1940

5th July 1940

9th July 1940

In The Court Of the 2nd Class Subjudge

At Gadag.

Exh. 212.

Civil Suit No. 277 of 1914.

Pleaders.

Mr. Guttal and Messrs. Pavte & Savkar.

Shriman Niranjan Jagatguru Andanswami Guru Andanswami, by his VatMakhtyar Somaya Shidlingaya

..Plaintiff.

against

Mr. Vinekar.

1. Totadswami guru Totadswami
2. Totaya Andanaya
3. Sangaya Channayya
4. Mariayya Sangayya
5. Totaya Adiveyya
6. Andaneppa Andaneppa
7. Adiveppa Pralhappa
8. Basappa Mallappa

..Defendants.

Claim Rs 10/-.

The plaintiff alleges that he is one of the Jagatgurus of the Lingayats; that he has many branch-Maths in the Presidencies of Bombay and Madras, in the territories of the Patwardhan Chiefs and of H.H. the Nizam; that plaintiff's gurus before him, and plaintiff, had, and have, the right of going in a procession seated in a cross-palanquin adorned with and accompanied by, panch-Kalash, and Biradavali; that they had, and have, that

Clerk of the Court.

right as Jagatgurus; that they have the right that their disciples should show them that honour in their own village and also when they go out visiting, in public streets; that plaintiff's gurus and the plaintiff have exercised this their right since ancient times; that this xxxxxxxxxx procession in a cross-palanquin is taken out in plaintiff's village Mundargi every year on Vaishak S- 10 & 11, last Monday and Tuesday in every Shravan, on Ashwin S. 10, and at the beginning of Margashirsha without fail; that it is taken out also when plaintiff is called by his disciples for worshipping his feet at their homes at all times of the year; that it is taken out also when plaintiff enters villages on his tours, and visits his disciples' houses for the worship of his feet;

that the roads followed in the processions in Mundargi in Vaishakh, Shravana, Ashwin, and Margashirsha are those detailed in the Schedule attached to the plaint; that plaintiff intended to take out a cross-palanquin procession on last Monday of Shrawan of Shake 1834; that defendant 1 induced defendant 2 to make an application to the 2nd Class Magistrate of Mundargi on 6-9-1912 and the other defendants, to the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, that there would be a breach of the peace; that the latter Magistrate stopped plaintiff's procession on 9-9-1912; and that appeals were preferred, but failed, hence this suit.

Plaintiff prays for an injunction to the defendants that they should not obstruct plaintiff in going in a cross-palanquin procession, with a Panch-Kalash and Biradavali, on Vaishakh S. 10 & 11, on last Monday and Tuesday in Shrawan, on Ashwin S. 10, and in the beginning of Margashirsha, in Mundargi and elsewhere at other times. He prays for costs also.

Defendants 1 and 3 contended (Ex. 17) that

Clerk of the Court.

Civil Couts have no jurisdiction to try this suit; that plaintiff is not a Jagatguru but defendant 1's disciple; that disciple before him, called Andanmaris like the plaintiff, denied that they were defendant 1's disciples (Shishyas), and the High Court has held that they were defendant 1's Shishyas or disciples; that the AndanMari before the plaintiff has admitted that he is defendant 1's disciple, and has passed a registered deed to that effect; that such Maris (disciples) have no such right of going in a cross-palanquin as claimed in the plaint; that they have no right to take out the processions mentioned in the Schedule attached to the plaint; that defendant 1 alone has the right to call himself Jagatguru and go in a cross-palanquin with Panch-Kalash and biraudavali and not the plaintiff;

that Government stopped plaintiff's procession, and was a necessary party; that plaintiff has no Mathas, as alleged, but they are all defendant 1's; and that defendant 1 has removed the plaintiff, and appointed another Andanswami.

Defendants 2 and 4 to 8 agreed to these contentions in Ex.17; See Ex.18.

The issues are :-

1. Is the right to parade in the cross-palanquin, as described in the plaint, a general right, exercisable by any subject of His Majesty ?
2. Is it a special right enjoyable by only defendant 1 ?
3. Is the plaintiff entitled to the injunction prayed for ?
4. To what reliefx is the plaintiff entitled ?
5. Has the plaintiff no right to march in a procession seated in a cross-palanquin as alleged in the plaint in public streets ?
6. Has defendant 1 the exclusive right of riding

Clerk of the court.

in a cross-palanquin as stated in the written statement ?

7. Is such a right (riding in a cross-palanquin) enforceable ?

8. Are the facts stated in para 2 of the plaint proved ?

9. Is not plaintiff entitled to the injunction prayed for ?

10. Has this Court jurisdiction to try this suit ?

No other sought.

My findings are :- 1. No. 2. It is a special right enjoyable by the defendant 1, and other high -- priests of the Hindus like him. 3. No. 4. None. 5. No. 6. Yes, as against the plaintiff. 7. No. 8. No. 9. No. 10. No.

Reasons.

For a thousand years before the 8th century A.D., Buddhism was supreme in India. It had transplanted the ancient Vedic Religion of the Hindus, as taught by the Upanishads, and by the Bhagavad-gita, composed more than a thousand years before the advent of Buddha. But Shri Shankaracharya, an inhabitant of Travancore, defeated it by his extraordinary learning, grasp, and unusual -- controversial ability. It was he who firmly established his Advaita teaching, which has been admitted by learned men everywhere to be one of the highest philosophies of the world. Shri Shankaracharya has never been surpassed for his forcible style, clear logic, and short pointed -- commentaries on all the Shrutis; so much so, that men, wonderstruck by his towering ability and almost supernatural powers, have thought him to be an incarnation of Shankar himself. He was a great traveller. He went over all India, and made his Adwaita doctrines supreme. He established four Maths on the four boundaries of this vast Peninsula; at Dwarka in the west, at Badri-Kedar in

Clerk of the Court.

the Himalayas on the north, at Puri in Orissa in the east, and at Shringeri in the south. The gurus in these four Maths were to take care of the spiritual welfare of the whole of India. As the line of Gurus at Badri became extinct, the Math there ceased to exist; but the remaining three flourish today. On account of these -- extraordinary achievements, his following which included kings, took out his palanquin in an extraordinary -- manner, viz crosswise. It was, and is, a mark of extraordinary honour and dignity. It is this honour and -- dignity that are now in dispute. There is another mark of the extraordinary dignity of the Shankaracharya and that is of lighting him with torches in the noonday sun. The parties however have not thought fit to quarrel -- over it.

The Advaita doctrine requires vast powers of grasp to understand it correctly, and a great amount of self-restraint and self-denial to adopt it in practice. Even today it has the effect of making weak men athiests and mischief-mongers. In course of time it was found to do more harm than good to the populace. Several eminent men, Ramanujacharya, Vallabhacharya, and Madhwacharya, have modified it in these parts. These Acharyas were great leaders of religious thought, and their followers also sometimes think of taking out their palanquins crosswise. Going in a cross-palanquin became therefore a sign of a great religious preceptor. A palan~~x~~quin is simply a conveyance or a vehicle; it can be ridden -- lengthwise by anybody; but long custom and usage have made a cross palanquin a mark of the highest learning and reverence, and none but the highest Swamis think of using it. The cause, why these great Acharyas are -- respected and worshipped by all, is their high learning and pure living, and a cross palanquin is only a sign of their godly qualities. But weakminded and shortsighted

Clerk of the Court.

men like the present parties, given up to physical pleasures and wordly objects, devoid of all self-respect and great learning, have mistaken the sign for the cause, and are quarrelling over it. The plaintiff's witnesses have gone so far as to say that even the most degraded human beings, holers, halalkhors or bhangis, Madars and all untouchables, can, with the plaintiff, who is a Jagat-guru, go in a cross- palanquin. It is a pity that they have lost all self-respect, and have turned their guru's cross-palanquin into a tonga or bullock cart, which is used by everybody on hire.

A cross palanquin being thus a sign of great honour and dignity, unaccompanied by any pecuniary profits, and not attached to any particular office, I shall examine whether a suit for it shall lie in a Civil Court under section 9 of the C.P. Code. I think that suits for an office are of a civil nature; but in my opinion a suit for vindication of a mere dignity, though connected with an office, is not. The present suit is not for a claim to an office, but for a claim to a mere honour and dignity on account of an office, and is, I think, not maintainable in a Civil Court. It has been held that the claim by a Swami, or archpriest, that he is entitled to be carried on a high road in a cross palanquin will not be entertained by a civil court. What is claimed in such a suit is a mere honour and dignity, a mark attached to the office of a Swami. It has been laid down that civil courts should discourage as much as possible claims of so unsubstantial and objectionable a nature, and they ought not to be involved in the determination of trivial questions of dignity and privilege, although connected with an office. See Shri Shankar v. Sidha (1843) 3 M.I.A. 198; I.L.R. 2 Bom 474; and 33 Bom. 278. The whole law on the subject is discussed in Mulla's Civil Procedure Code, 5th edition

Clerk of the Court.

1913, p-18, and his Jurisdiction of Courts in matters of caste, pp. 10 to 19. I need not quote the decisions -- cited therein at length. The suit must fail.

But it must fail also on other grounds and on the evidence in the case. Even the plaintiff's own witnesses, Exs. 89, 90, 91 admit that a cross-palanquin is a token of very high and pious respect amongst Hindus, and that all persons cannot go in it, according to the prevailing -- custom. But the plaintiff says, "What is there in law to prevent me in going in a cross-palanquin in imitation of the spiritual head of the Hindus, or wearing a crown in imitation of their temporal head? A cross palanquin is a mere conveyance like a tonga, a horse, or an ass, and a crown is merely a covering for the head like a topi or a turban; and under the British Rule of perfect equality, I can use both in the public streets. " I think the -- police will summarily teach him, if he jests with a crown, that he is wrong; and I must tell him that, although he can physically go in a cross-palanquin, he must not do so, as he would hurt the feelings of Hindus, who, by long -- custom and usage having the force of law, begun to reserve a cross-palanquin for their highest gurus. Long custom is binding on the plaintiff, and he must not transgress it, if the feelings of others would be hurt. Customs may be broken only when nobody's feelings would be affected. For instance, anybody can go out on an ass; in Persia -- riding a well-groomed and well fed ass is a mark of -- respectability; and plaintiff may go out on it, because he would thereby amuse the beholders, riding an ass being considered as the greatest indignity a man ~~x~~ can do himself in India. But he must be careful as to how he uses the cross-palanquin. That is reserved for the arch-priests of the Hindus. See Exs. 134, 136 to 140, 146 to 148. I hold as a fact that going in a cross-palanquin in a public --

Clerk of the Court.

street is not the common right of every subject of His Majesty, but the special privilege of a Jagatguru or a high priest (lit. preceptor of the world) of a specific, doctrinal section of the Hindus, and that -- plaintiff is not entitled to use it as a mere subject of His Majesty, in contravention of custom having the force of law.

In fact the plaintiff is himself aware of the false and crooked reasoning he has adopted. He is aware of the absurdity and impracticability of these levelling and libertine doctrines of universal equality; for he claims, in the alternative, this dignity of a cross palanquin as a priest, a swami, a *Virakta*, one who has gone ahead of the world in renouncing it. See his Mukhtyar's deposition, Ext. 32, and his pleader's -- purshis, Ext. 126. I have been pressing the plaintiff's pleader from the beginning to induce plaintiff to come to Court, and explain to me himself his peculiar -- notions of dignity. I wished to ask him whether a -- *Virakta* is at all allowed to sue in Courts. The very idea of a holy swami suing is repugnant to a Hindu mind. But he did not come till the end. I would have given him my reasons above for holding that he must be something more than a priest to go in a cross palanquin. I hold as a fact that any swami or *Virakta* cannot, -- according to long usage, go in a cross palanquin, but -- only a high priest.

But plaintiff says that he is a Jagatguru or arch-priest of the Lingaits, and so entitled to the -- honour in dispute. I find that he is not a Jagatguru, but a mere disciple of the defendant 1, who is a high priest of the Lingaits. The Jagatguru is the defendant 1, the representative of the Jagatgurus, the Totadswamis, of Dambal. There are also other Jagatgurus or high -- priests of the Lingaits; e.g. the Gangadharswami of the

Clerk of the Court.

Mursavir-Math of Hubli and the Murgi-swami of Chitra - Kaldurg; see Exts. 29, 100, 139, 140, 146 (Rao Saheb Irappa Manwi), 147, 148. The Totadswamis had their representatives or disciples at Mundargi, and they were called -- Annadanswamis. The plaintiff is an Annadanswami of -- Mundargi, and a disciple and subordinate of the Totadswamis of Dambal and Gadag. The plaintiff's Mukhtyar, ~~at~~ Ext. 32, has been unable to mention any independent swamis before the plaintiff's gurus. In fact no such independent Annadanswamis of Mundargi existed; they were simply the nominees of defendant 1 and the other Totadswamis who went before him; an Annadanswami was not appointed by his predecessor, but by the Totadswami of Dambal and Gadag.

The point has in fact been set at rest by a decision of the High Court in Appeal No. 277 of 1875 between the parties' predecessors. Ext. 201 is the copy of the judgment. It has been held that the tenure -- upon which the Annadanswami~~x~~ held lands was such that the Totadswami was entitled to resume possession of them at pleasure. The clear acknowledgment by Annadanswami in writing of the Totadswami's spiritual supremacy is mentioned therein. It is shown that the -- defendant 1's predecessor had nominated the plaintiff's predecessor to the office of Andanswami in '49, and that the Andanswamis held lands as Vahiwatdars of the Totadswamis, as their agents and representatives. In fact -- their Lordships have held that the Andanswamis like the plaintiff have no independent rights of a Jagatguru. The only conclusion that follows is that the plaintiff is not entitled to the right of riding a cross-palanquin in the public streets, because that right belongs to an independent swami, which the plaintiff is not. The -- Collector and the Government in appeal have held that the Andanswamis have set up this right only recently,

Clerk of the Court.

and that they were subordinates of defendant 1:see Exts. 207 and 200. The plaintiff has filed numerous documents to show that he is an ancient Jagatguru, independent of the Totadswamis; but they contain nothing to prove any such fact, or to show that the conclusion arrived at by the High Court mentioned above is not correct. I will briefly mention them. Ext.174 is a Sanad granted by -- Government in '62 for a land to the Math-Jangam Andanswami Mundargi of Dambal; Ext.175 is a similar Sanad -- for 2 lands to Andanswami Mundargi, and Exts.176 to 178 are copies of the Register of Sanads for lands issued to the same Swami. ~~X~~ Ext.155 is a similar Inamati Chitha. Exts.179 to 182 are copies of the Record of Rights for lands in the possession of plaintiff, and Ext.173 is a rent note taken by his predecessor for a land and Math in Madagnur. The villagers of Mundargi (Ext.168) and plaintiff's predecessor (Ext.210) said in '60 that the latter was independent of the Totadswamis; but the High Court decided in the appeal of 1875 that they were not. Plaintiff's Guru passed a will to plaintiff in 1888, Ext. 124; but that was unauthorised. Government have addressed plaintiff as Jagatguru:see Exts.169,170,171, dated 1/2; but that was because he addressed them as such. Similarly plaintiff's follower passed a gift deed to him in 1908, Ex.118, as Jagatguru, and other followers addressed him letters, Exts 154,158,161,163,164,172; but they prove -- nothing as against the defendant~~x~~.1. On the contrary the documents filed by the defendant 1 show that he is the Jagatguru, and the superior of Andanswamis, the plaintiff and his predecessors. Exts.150,151,197 are gift deeds passed to plaintiff's predecessors as Jagatgurus. Ext.199 is a receipt dated more than 70 years ago passed to -- Andanswami as the Totadswami's disciple, and Exts.183 to 198 are letters addressed by plaintiff's guru to deft 1 as his subordinate. Out of these Exts.189.191 to 194 --

Clerk of the Court.

were filed in the old suit. After the litigation in the High Court ended, the two Swamis had reconciled; see the report of the reconciliation in the local newspaper, Ext. 145. The plaintiff's Mukthyar had indeed -- put an end to this discussion by admitting in his -- deposition before me, Ext. 32, and in the Dharwar Court, Ext. 84, that plaintiff began to call himself Jagatguru since October 1912. I hold that plaintiff has not -- proved that he is a Jagatguru and a high priest of the Lingaits, independent of the defendant 1. He is not -- therefore entitled to the right of going in a cross-palanquin with the insignia of *Panch-Kalash* and the -- *birudavali* as against his guru the defendant 1.

The plaintiff also claims the right on -- account of alleged long and ancient enjoyment of it. But I find that he is not the representative of any long line of gurus, who enjoyed any such right since ancient times. His Mukthyar (Ext. 32) admits that -- plaintiff's Math is established recently by his predecessor some 50 or 60 years ago after he was expelled by defendant, from the structure he occupied on his -- behalf; that was in execution of the High Court decree in Appeal No. 277/1875 mentioned above. Defendant 1 -- obtained permissions to build his new Math in 1689 and 1898: see Ext. 127. Plaintiff's Mukthyar, Ext. 32, has been unable to give the names of any predecessors of the -- plaintiff, and has given no evidence to prove the -- ancient user of a cross palanquin by any of plaintiff's ancient gurus. It would have been better if the --- plaintiff himself had stood in the witness box and -- given his reasons in support of the alleged ancient enjoyment; but he has not, in spite of my repeated -- suggestions to that effect. He appears to me to be a recent upstart for the claim to the title of a Jagat-

Clerk of the Court.

Jagatguru; see Exts. 29, 134, 136 to 140, 143, 146 to 148, some of whom say that plaintiff was given Ashram -- (initiation in the order of Sanyasis) by his guru -- defendant 1 more than a dozen years ago. He contended that there were two separate Samsthanas of Mundargi and Dambal, belonging to plaintiff and defendant 1 respectively, independent of each other. He cited and examined Exts. 85, 98, 101, 102, 106 to 110, 112 to 115 to prove his independent Samsthan of Mundargi, but I disbelieve those witnesses; that is not what Ext. 32 himself and his -- other witnesses say. He examined Exts. 85, 88 to 91, 96 to 102, 104 to 116, 119 to 121 to show that he and his gurus went in the streets of Mundargi and Gadag seated in a cross palanquin with Panch-Kalasha and birudavali --- (paraphernalia explained by Exts. 97, 108, 115) as --- independent Jagatgurus. I disbelieve those witnesses. He produced Exts. 166, 167, copies of the Mysore Star, and handbills, Exts. 159, 160, 165, 202, 204 to 206, to show that he went in a cross palanquin; but I find that the -- latter is not even mentioned in some of these. Exts. 156, 157, and the Collector's order, Ext. 207, show that --- defendant 1's nominee went in a cross-palanquin in -- Mundargi. The Collector has rightly stopped all cross-palanquin processions in Mundargi except when defendant 1 himself was going in it; the Pant-Pratinidhi under the Peshwa rule has also rightly stopped all independent -- pretensions of the Andanswamis: see Ext. 131. On the whole I find as a fact that whatever defendant 1 has done, and whatever his predecessors did, in connection with a -- cross-palanquin, was as a representative and subordinate of defendant 1, and not as an independent Jagatguru.

Under the circumstances the rulings quoted on behalf of the plaintiff, that the streets in plaintiff's village Mundargi, being public, can be used for this lawful purpose of going in a cross-palanquin, do not apply.

Clerk of the Court.

They are I.L.R. 26 Mad. 376, 30 Mad. 185, and 34 Bom. 571, and the previous decisions quoted therein. The streets are public no doubt; but they are not to be used for trespassing on the rights of the arch-priests of the Hindus who alone are entitled to go in them in a cross-palanquin with its paraphernalia, and not their subordinates and disciples like the plaintiff, nor members of the -- public at large.

On all the points, therefore, put forth by the plaintiff, the suit must fail.

Order.

I dismiss the suit with costs. Plaintiff to pay defendants' costs.

26-1-1916. Sd/H. V. Kane.

Subjudge.

Typed by

Read by

Compared by

Karkun

"True Copy"

Clerk of the Court.

5/7/40

Presented [illegible] [illegible] from [illegible]

J A Gray

[illegible]

[illegible]

29th June 40

6th July 1940

9th July 1940

Sig to

COURT FEE
13-8-1940
EIGHT ANNAS
INDIA
8As

WORDS:- 2880.
Copying. Rs. 5-7-0.
Comparing. Rs. 1-6-0.
Paper. Rs. 0-2-0.
Total amount. Rs. 6-15-0.

In the District Court of Dharwar.

At Dharwar. Ex. No. 16.

Civil Appeal No. 53 of 1916 from Decree in Civil Suit No. 277 of 1914 of the Court of the Sub-Judge of Gadag.

Pleaders:-

Mr. Pawate.

1. Shriman Niranjana Jagadguru Andaniswami Guru Andaniswami Sansthana Matha Mundargi by his Vatmokthiyar Somayya Shidlingayya Hammigi now Seltaya Mahalingayya Mundargi.

.. .. .. Appellant
(Original
Plaintiff.

Against.

Messrs Shivrao and Vinekar for No. 1.
others absent.

1. Totadswami Guru Totadswami of Gadag.
2. Totaya Andanaya Mangalur of Mundargi.
3. Sangaya Channaya Shettar of Do.
4. Mariyaya Sangaya Shantageri of Do.
5. Totaya Adiveya Gandhada of Do.
6. Adivepa Totapa Shabadi of Do.
7. Basappa Mallappa Baligar of Huvin-hadagali.
8. Andaneppa Kaulpeti of Mundargi.

Responde
(Original
Defts).

Claim - Rs. 10/-.

The Plaintiff appellant styles himself Jag -guru Andaniswami of the Mundargi Math. He states that he, and his Gurus before him, as Jagadgurus, have exercised the right of being carried in a cro -palanquin in a procession, that on September 1912

Clerk of the Court.

the defts by obtaining an order from a Magistrate stopped the procession. The suit is for an injunction. It appears that the usage of riding in a cross-palanquin was first started by the great Shankaracharya founder of the Smarth sect of Brahmins. This practice has been adopted by others since his time and is looked upon as a valuable religious ~~d~~ dignity and privilege. The only question I am concerned with in this appeal is whether the suit will lie. I am of opinion that the suit is not one cognizable by the Civil Courts and I dismiss this appeal with costs.

In considering the authorities the right claimed by the appellant may be regarded in two aspects, first as a religious dignity and privilege and secondly, as a right to take a procession through the public streets. From either point of view the current of Bombay decisions is against the appellant.

In Madhusudan Parwat Vs. Shri Shankara~~char~~charya (I. L. R. 33 Bom. 278) it has been held that "To decide disputes as to precedence or privilege between purely religious functionaries is no part of the business of the Civil Courts; nor will they grant injunctions to prevent preachers from preaching where they like under any title they please, provided no office or property is disturbed or interfered with." In this case there is not the slightest suggestion that the appellant's office as head of the Mundargi math has in any way been affected.

The High Courts of Bombay and Madras hold divergent views with regard to suits brought to enforce a right to conduct a religious procession. The leading case is Bombay is Satku Wd. Khadir Vs.

Clerk of the Court.

Ibrahim Aga (I. L. R. 2 Bom., 457) followed in Khaji Sajaudin Vs. Madhavadas (I. L. R. 18 Bom., 693) and Virupaxappa Vs. Sherifsab (11 Bom. L. R. 372). In Satku's case the plffs as members of the Mohamada community claimed a right to take their Tabuts along a certain road. The Defts had obtained an order from a Magistrate just as in the present case and had prevented them. The English law on the subject is based on the maxim 'Interest reipublicae ut sit finis litium'. It is held that where a public right is obstructed no individual can bring a suit without proving particular damage. Otherwise there would be danger of the Courts being flooded by a multiplicity of suits. After reviewing the authorities at great length Westropp C.J. came to the conclusion that the mere absence of religious and sentimental gratification was not a sufficient particular damage to give a cause of action where a person had been obstructed in exercising a right of way on a public road. A case which was more especially relied upon was the Privy Council case reported in % 3 M. I. A., a case which came from this District and related to the very privilege now the subject of contention. The Lingayats and Brahmins of Hubli were disputing the point whether the spiritual leader of the Lingayats could be carried in a cross-palanquin. The Privy Council remanded the case for a fresh trial, and one of the issues ordered to be tried was whether the suit would lie. The Judges of the Bombay High Court held that the right of being carried in a cross-palanquin was too unsubstantial to be the subject of a Civil Suit. There was no further appeal from this decision. The only Bombay Case which the appellant can quote in his favour is Baslingappa Parappa Vs. Dharmappa Basappa (I.L.R. 34 Bom., 571). I cannot regard this decision as over-ruling Satku's case, because although that

Clerk of the Court.

authority is mentioned it is neither discussed nor distinguished nor reversed. In the judgment the Madras case of Sadagopalacharya Vs. Ramrao (I.L.R. 26 Mad., 376) is quoted as an authority for the -- proposition that every member of the public and every sect has a right to use the public streets in a - lawful manner. This, however, is quite a different question from the one I am now considering. Every sect may have the right to carry their leader in a cross-palanquin. The question is whether the Courts will enforce that right without proof of particular damage. This question did not arise in Sadagopalacharya's case. It is no doubt true that the Madras High Court have distinguished the leading Bombay -- case (Satku's case) above ~~m~~ discussed. But the - reason given is open to objection. I refer to - Kandaswami Mudali Vs. Subraya (I. L. R. 32 Mad., 478). The cause of action in that case was said to be a Magistrate's order prohibiting a - - procession whereas it was assumed that in Satku's case it was mere unaided obstruction by the defts. It will be found however that in Satku's case also the defts had obtained a Magistrate's order. It does not appear to make any difference to the jurisdiction of the Courts whether the defts enlist - the help of the Magistrates or not, in obstructing the alleged right. In the present appeal the ~~appell~~ appellant's pleader tries to distinguish Satku's case on a new ground. He says that there the plffs brought their suit as members of a certain community while here it is an individual who is suing. I do not think that the question of jurisdiction can - depend on whether the Swami brings the suit himself or has a suit brought by his followers.

4th July 1917. Sd. E.Clements.

District Judge.

Typed by,

Read by,

Compared by,

I. G. Gupte

"TRUE COPY"

CLERK OF THE COURT

Appeal No. 53 of 1916.

Plaintiff appeals on the following grounds.

1. The decision of the Lower Court is against law and evidence in the case.

2. The Lower Court was wrong in holding that the right to parade in a cross palanquin was not a general right, exercisable by any subject of His Majesty.

3. The Lower Court was in error in deciding that the plff had no right to march in a procession seated in a cross~~x~~-palanquin in public streets.

4. The Court erred in holding that the facts mentioned in para 2 of the plaint were not proved.

5. The Court below was wrong in holding - that the right to enjoy a cross-palanquin procession with birudawale belonged to defendants exclusively as against the plaintiff.

6. The Court below was wrong in holding that the suit was outside the cognizance of the - Civil Court.

7. The Subordinate Judge did not apply a free and unbiased mind to the case before him as is apparent from the many unmerited gratuitous - insults which the Sub-Judge gives under cover of his judgment.

8. The Lower Court imported its own learning in the case in the delineation of the origin of the cross palanquin processions. The extraordinary ability or otherwise of Shree Shankarachar was quite beside the point as also was the history of the Mathas founded by him.

9. It is quite improper for the Lower Cour to characterise the plff as a weak minded and short-sighted man given up to physical pleasure and - worldly objects and devoid of all self respect and learning. The remarks are it is humbly submitted

Clerk of the Court.

most unbecoming in a judgment.

10. The witnesses for the Plff have only stated what the position of the law is in the matter of public processions. Their depositions should not affect the right of the plaintiff.

11. The Lower Court erred in holding that the right ~~of the p~~ claimed by the appellant was only a ~~rig~~ right to a dignity and nothing more. He had a right to go in a public street in such manner as is consistent with law and that right was interfered with by the defts. The right to proceed in a cross-palanquin with birudavali is incidental to the right of using a high way which is a substantial right.

12. The Lower Court has misunderstood and misapplied the decisions in Shankar Vs. Shidlingaya. 3 M.I.A. 198, 2 Bombay 494 and 33 Bombay 278.

13. The Lower Court has not considered the cases quoted for the appellant and it has not mentione them in the judgment.

14. The Plff and his witnesses never stated that the plff would use the crown in a public street like a topi. This unfounded statement fathered on the plff only indicates the prejudice of the Court.

15. The Lower Court was wrong in thinking that the right of the plif depended on the question whether the feelings of others would be wounded or not

16. There was no evidence to show that the feelings of others would be wounded if the plff rode a cross palanquin.

17. The learned Subordinate Judge was not justified in stigmatizing the plff's claim as due to liberative principles. The language is quite objectionable.

18. The Court below is wrong in holding that the plff was not a Jagad-guru.

19. The Court below is wrong in drawing an adverse inference against the plif for his not coming

Clerk of the Court.

into Court. The Plff's Mukhatyar was able to answer all the questions put to him by the Court.

20. It was wrong to hold that only the Swam Chitradurga of Hubli together with deft 1 were entitled to be Jagad-gurus. The ~~titl~~ title of a Jagad-guru was not derived from a royal grant. Any Guru whois held in high reverence by his followers and has a - numerous following is called a Jagad-guru.

21. The Subordinate Judge was wrong in holding that the plff's Math was not ancient and the - plff and his predecessors were only the desciples and nominies of deft 1 and his predecessors.

22. The decision in appeal No. 272 of 1875 of the High Court could not and did not establish - lenial subordination of the plff and his predecessors and successors to deft 1 and his predecessors and -- successors.

23. The Lower Court was wrong in holding tha the plff was initiated into the Wirakta order by deft

24. The Lower Court was wrong in not believing the witnesses for the plff whose evidence established that the plff and his ancestors enjoyed that right of passing in a cross-palanquin from time - - immemorial.

25. The Lower Court was wrong in holding tha the Matha of the Plff was not as ancient and degnifie as that of the deft 1.

26. The decision was given on 26-1-1916,. - Copies were applied for on 31-1-1916 and were ready on 7-2-16. Hence the appeal is in time.

27. The value of the appeal for Court fee is Rs. 5/- for declaration and Rs. 5/- for injunction. - That for jurisdiction is R. - - (not mentioned).

"TRUE COPY".

CLERK OF THE COURT.
6-7-48.

Typed by,
Typist.

Read by,

Compared by,
Karkun.

(Presented by [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

K 267

Sectioner, Mr. Raghunath Kale 2-8-0 20Fls.
Examiner Mr. V.J.Gavaskar)
Reader Mr.K.C.Vengurlekar) 0-10-0
Papercharge 0- 0-8

Total...Rs. 3- 2-8

Rupees three, annas two and pies eight only.

INDIA 8AS
COURT FEE EIGHT ANNAS

Copy applied for on 1-7-40
Copy ready on 10-7-40
11-7-40
sent by V.P.P. ~~Regd. Post~~ on

Assistant Sheristedar.

Dy. Sheristedar.

10-7-40

Appeal No.822 of 1917 from Appellate Decree.

Shreeman Niranjan Jagadguru Andaniswami
Guru Andaniswami Sansthan-Math Mundargi
by his Vatmukhtyar Solbaya Mahalingaya
(Original Plaintiff)..................Appellant.

Versus

Totadswami Guru Totadswami; and others)
(Original Defendants).................) Respondents.

Second Appeal against the decision of M. Clements, Esquire., District Judge at Dharwar, in Appeal No.53 of 1916.

The Hon'ble Sir Thomas Strangman with Mr.S.V. Palekar for the Appellant.

Mr. Dhurandhar with Mr.V.R.Sirur for Respondents Nos.1 to 5 and 8.

------

the Jagadgurus

Judgment:-The Plaintiff alleged that he was one of the Lingayats, that he had many branch maths in the Presidencies of Bombay and Madras, in the territories of the Patwardhan Chiefs and of His Highness the Nizam, that Plaintiff's Gurus before him had and plaintiff has the right of going in procession seated in a cross palanquin adorned with and accompanied by Panch-Kalash and barudavali, that they had and have that right as Jagadgurus, that they have a right that their disciples should show them that honour in their own village and also when they go out visiting in public streets, that the Plaintiff's Gurus had and plaintiff has exercised this their right since ancient times, that the procession in a cross-palanquin is taken out in plaintiff's village Mundarigi every year on Vaishakh Sud 10 and 11, last Monday and Tuesday in every Shrawana, on Ashwin, Sud 10 and at the beginning of Margashirsha without fail. It is taken out also when plaintiff is called by his disciples for worshipping his feet at their homes at all times of the year, it is taken out also when the plaintiff enters villages on his tours and visits his disciples' houses for the worshipping of his feet, that the plaintiff intended to take out a cross palanquin procession on last Monday Shrawana of Shake 1834, that the 1st defendant induced defendant 2 to make an application to the 2nd Class Magistrate of Mundarigi on the 6th of September 1912 and the other defendants to the Sub-Divisional Magistrate that there would be a breach of the peace, that the latter Magistrate stopped the plaintiff's procession on the 9th of September 1912 and that appeals were preferred, but, failed and hence the suit. The plaintiff prayed (for an injunction against the defendants that they should not obstruct the plaintiff in going in a cross-palanquin procession with a Panch-Kalash and Birudavali on Vaishak Sud 10 and 11, on last Monday and Tuesday in Shrawana, on Ashwin Sud 10 and in the beginning of Margashirsha in Mundarigi and ~~also~~ else where at other times.

The defendants 1 and 3 contended that the Civil Courts had no jurisdiction to try this suit, that the plaintiff was not a Jagadguru, but defendant No.1's disciple, that disciples before him called Andanmaris like the plaintiff denied that they were defendant 1's disciples (Shishyas) and the High Court held that they were defendant 1's Shishyas or disciples, that the Andanmari before the plaintiff had admitted that he was defendant 1's disciple and had passed a registered

HIGH COURT

deed to that effect, that such Maris have no such right of going in a cross-palanquin as claimed in the plaint, that they have no right to take out the procession mentioned in the Schedule attached to the plaint and that the 1st defendant alone had the right to call himself Jagadguru and go in a cross-palanquin with Panch-Kalash and Biradavali and not the plaintif

It may be said therefore on those pleadings that the ~~plaintiffs~~ plaintiff claimed to have the right of bein carried in a cross-palanquin in procession as Jagadguru. That was a religious dignity and privilege not for every member of the public, but for himself as Jagadguru. It was the plaintiff who claimed to be carried in procession by his disciples in order that they might worship his feet in their homes, and to be carried in procession on particular days of the year.

The 1st issue raised in the trial Court was, Is the right to parade in the cross-palanquin as described in the plaint a general right exercisable by a subject of His Majesty? It is difficult to see at first sight how that issue came to be raised. Certain it is not relevant to the pleadings. But when issues are raised under Order ~~XIV~~ XIV rule 1(5), the Court shall, after reading the plaint and the written statement, if any, and after such examination of the parties as may appear necessary, ascertain upon what material proposition of fact or of law the parties are at variance an shall thereupon proceed to frame and record the issue on which the right decision of the case appears to depend. It appears from the record that the plaintiff never attended the Court and therefore ~~it~~ he could not have been examined by the Judge. It seems obvious tha the plaintiff's pleader must have seen the danger he wa in of losing his case as he insisted upon plaintiff's claiming the privilege of being carried in a cross palanquin for himself as Jagadguru. He must have argue before the Court that the plaintiff's suit could succeed, because, he as a member of the public had the right to use the road in any way he pleased provided he did not inconvenience the other members of the public who had equal rights themselves. But it appears to me that this issue ought never to have been admitted. It is absolutely inconsistent with the Plaintiff's own case and I cannot imagine that a party in the position of the plaintiff would ever have filed this suit claiming the right to be carried in procession in a cross palanquin not because he was a Jagadguru but because he was a member of the public. In *Mahomed Buksh* Vs. *Hosseini Bibi* (1888) (L.R.15 I.A.81) Their Lordships of the Privy Council dealt with the question of raising issues inconsistent with the case made out by the plaintiff. Their Lordships at page 86 said "On the 16th of March 1882 issues were settled. Amongst the issues was this: '2nd whether the Hibbanama on behalf of Shahzadi Bibi is genuine and valid and executed with her knowledge and consent, or whether it was manufactured without her knowledge and consent, or whether it was executed under undue influence?' In their Lordships' opinion the latter part of that issue ought not to have been admitted. It was absolutely inconsistent with the case made by the plaintiff. It only becomes possible on the assumption that the alleged cause of action is unfounded. There was another issue which also was admissible on that assumption, viz., whether in case the said Hibbanama is proved to be genuine, it is invalid on any ground according to Mahomedan Law." Applying those remarks to this case this issue only becomes possible on the assumption that the alleged cause of action in the plaint is unfounded, namely, plaintiff's claim that he as Jagadguru was entitled to be carried in procession in a cross palanquin as a religious dignity and privilege. That cause of action disappears entirely if the plaintiff were to allege that he was entitled to be carried in that way not because he was a Jagadguru, but because he happened to be a member of the public entitled to use the street in any reasonable way. The suit was dismissed by the trial Court as it found on the 2nd issue that this was a special right enjoyable by the defendant No.1 and other high priests of the Hindus like him, that the plaintiff had no right to march in procession seated in a cross palanquin as alleged in the plaint in public streets and that the 1st defendant had an exclusive right of riding in a cross palan quin as against the plaintiff. But the lower Cour also held that he had no jurisdiction to try the suit The learned Judge said "I shall examine whether a sai for this honour and dignity unaccompanied by any pecuniary profits and not attached to any particular office shall lie in a civil Court under section 9 of the Civil Procedure Code. I think that suits for an office are of a civil nature, but in my opinion a suit for vindication for a mere dignity, though connected with an office, is not. The present suit is not for a claim to an office, but for a claim to a mere honour and dignity on account of an office and as I think no maintainable in a civil suit. It has been held that th the claim by a Swami or Arch priest that he is entitled to be carried on a high road in a cross palanquir will not be entertained by a civil Court. What is clai -ed in such a suit is a mere honour and dignity, a mar attached to the office of a Swami. It has been laid down that civil Courts should discourage as far as possible claims of so unsubstantial and objectionable a nature and they ought not to be involved in the determination of trivial questions of dignity and privilege although connected with an office." Reference was made to Sri Sunkur Vs. Sidha (1843) (3 M.I.A. 198). In first appeal the learned Judge said "in considering the authorities the right claimed by the appellant may be regarded in two aspects, first as a religious dignity and privilege and secondly as a right to take a procession through public streets. From either point of view the current of Bombay decisions is against the appellant. In Madhusudan Parvat Vs. Shri Shankaracharya: (1908) (I.L.R.33 Bom.278) it has been held that 'to decide disputes as to ~~procedure~~ precedence or privilege between purely religious functions is no part of the business of the civil Courts, nor will they grant injunctions to prevent preachers from preaching where they like, under any title they please, provided no office or property is disturbed or interfered with.' In this case there is not the slightest suggestion that the appellant's office as the Head of Mundargi Math has in any way been affected." The learned Judge also referred to a Madras case-Sadagopachariar Vs. Rama Rao: (1902) (I.L.R.26 Mad.376)-which was cited for the proposition that every member of the public and every sect has a right to use the public streets in a lawful manner. The learned Judge very rightly remarked that every sect may have the right to carry their leader in a cross palanquin. The question is whether the Court will enforce that right without proof of particular damage. It appears therefore to me that the authorities are perfectly clear. Civil Courts will not entertain a claim of this nature and really the argument that was addressed to us in second appeal was that we ought to deal with the case as if the plaintiff was suing as a member of the public claiming as such to be entitled to be carried in a cross-palanquin if he chose to adopt that method of procession. As I pointed out, that was not the plaintiff's case and I doubt whether if we allowed the plaint to be amended, plaintiff would put his signature to such an amendment, In my opinion therefore the appeal fails and the suit should be dismissed with costs.

11th August 1920. Sd/-N.C.Macleod.

I agree.

11th August 1920. Sd/- C. Fawcett.

True Copy.

M. G. Rao

for Deputy Registrar.

The 10th of July 1940.

HIGH COURT

Presented copy for official [illegible]

L B [illegible]

[illegible]

14/8/1940

Read:- (1) Application dated 20-6-40 from the residents of Mundargi-Petha and disciples of Shri Jagadguru Annadan Mahaswami Guru Annadana Swami of Mundargi through their pleaders, Rao Bahadur [illegible] and Rao Bahadur D.L.Patil.

(2) Application dated 19-6-40 from the [illegible] Shiddayya [illegible] of Tontadswami Math, Gadag and Dambal, through the pleaders Messrs. [illegible] and [illegible].

(3) Report of the District Superintendent of Police, Dharwar No.632 of 20-6-40.

(4) Report of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, No.2307 dated 1-7-40.

and (5) Report of the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, [illegible] Division, Dharwar No.[illegible], dated 5-7-40.

* * * *

([illegible] 253)
Office of the District Magistrate,
Dharwar, 7-7-1940.

Note:-

The applicants, residents of Mundargi and disciples of Shri Annadani Swami Math of Mundargi request permission to take out cross palanquin procession of Shri Annadani Swami of Mundargi on 11-7-40 through the streets of Mundargi. The Police Sub-Inspector and also the Mahalkari, Mundargi report that there is no objection to grant the permission as there is no likelihood of breach of peace and no obstruction to traffic would be caused thereby. After considering objections raised on behalf of Shriman Tontadswami of Gadag, the District Superintendent of Police and the Sub-Divisional Magistrate also have reported that there is no objection to grant the permission. Since it is reported by all the officers and stated by the applicants also in their application that there is no likelihood of breach of the peace and no obstruction to traffic would be caused, hence the District Magistrate, Dharwar, also has no objection to the applicants taking out the cross-palanquin procession in question if it is customary to do so and subject to the condition that they should obtain the necessary pass from the Police authorities for the procession after specifying the route, times etc., of the procession as required by the District Police Act.

2. If Shriman Tontadswami and his disciples consider -

[illegible] 717

[illegible]

Copy of order passed by the [illegible] of Navalgund Taluka in [illegible] No. 16/[illegible]

[illegible] 14 [illegible] 195[illegible].

In the Court of the Addl. [illegible] of [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Versus

[illegible]

Order

The applicant is the [illegible] of S. Nos. 330, 351, 302A and 352 of Ammeeri village and the opponent is the protected tenant thereof. The [illegible] that the present rent [illegible] by the opponent [illegible] per annum is too low in consideration of the high level of prices now prevailing and therefore reasonable rent should be fixed for those lands. The opponent on the other hand contends that the rent now paid by him is quite reasonable and hence there are no grounds for enhancing the same.

The total area of the four S. Nos.

27-

comes to 52-11-0 and the assessment thereon comes to Rs 110-0-0. The average assessment therefore comes to approximately Rs 2-1-[illegible] per acre. The local inspection of the lands shows that an area of about 0-11-0 is not fit for cultivation because there is burial ground [illegible] area of about 0-7-0 acres there is stone quarry in an area of about 0-4-0 So the area that is unfit for cultivation is 5-2-0

The lands almost adjoin Hubli Gadag road and are very close to the village and there is no doubt keen demand for these land because of their favourable situation. The soil of S.No. 33c is mixed with stone while the soil of the remaining 3 S.Nos is red and black. The lands are slightly slopy from west to east but it does not affect the fertility of the soil and the growth of crops in no way hindered. In fact from a distance the lands appear level and they [illegible]. They are free from [illegible] and there are no big water courses which would damage the crops sown in the land

The applicant says that they are the [illegible] therefore request [illegible] be fixed [illegible] the average [illegible] normal yield of crops [illegible] is as under.—

(1) Cotton 16 maunds per kurgi i.e. 4 acres

(2) Wheat about 10 bags per kurgi, i.e.

(3) Jowar about 20 bags per kurgi.

He further adds that even groundnut can be grown in these lands. But he is unable to give the estimated yield of that crop.

The opponent on the other hand says that due to a watercourse in one of the S.Nos. and as the lands are slopy and are also subject to damages by stray cattle the crops do not thrive well. According to his ~~[illegible]~~ estimate the average normal yield of crops would be as under.—

(1) Cotton about 24 to 36 maunds per Kurgi (4 acres)

(2) Wheat [illegible] per [illegible]

(3) [illegible]

[illegible] research [illegible]

The [illegible] that [illegible] in [illegible] 2 [illegible] etc. [illegible]

The [illegible] these [illegible] are not [illegible] and [illegible] damage to [illegible] also [illegible] from [illegible] the [illegible] not more

I have [illegible] the lands personally and left [illegible] note of inspection. The [illegible] state [illegible] I found the soil [illegible] slightly [illegible] sand. The other [illegible] Nos [illegible] of best type for the purpose of [illegible] Terrace and Agricultural Lands [illegible] The yield per acre of the them [illegible] in [illegible] for [illegible] for [illegible]

(1) [illegible] 52 lbs

(2) [illegible] lbs

(3) Cotton [illegible] lbs.

(4) [illegible] lb.

According to this the average [illegible] for [illegible]

½ bags [illegible] of [illegible] times in [illegible]

Looking to the condition of the lands I am of opinion that this is the proper estimate and hence should be accepted for fixing the reasonable rent. The estimate given by the tenant is exaggerated, while the opponent has positively under estimated the yield. So I cannot accept the estimate given by either party when the figures published in the Gazette can be safely relied upon in this case so far as the yield of Jawar and wheat is concerned. With regard to cotton however the average of crop for 1949-50 is not given [illegible] as to be for use [illegible] the opponent himself admits that the average yield of this crop per Kurgi (i.e. per 4 acres) would be about 36 maunds. The applicant says that it would be about 76 maunds per Kurgi. This is obviously too much and cannot be accepted at all. But as the opponent himself — admits the average yield as "about" 35 maunds — per Kurgi I take this figure as correct for fixing the reasonable rent. So far the purpose of reasonable rent the following average yield is taken.

(1) Jawar 2½ bags per acre
(2) Wheat 2 bags per acre
(3) Cotton 9 maunds per acre

The value of of these crops according to the prevailing rates comes to:-

(1)	Jawar	Rs 57-13-0
(2)	Wheat	Rs 71-14-0
(3)	Cotton	Rs. 90-0-0
	Total.	219-11-0

The average value of crops in an area of one acre would therefore come to Rs 73-4-0 approximately. The lands being dry crop lands the maximum rent per acre would be one-third of Rs 73-4-0 which comes to Rs 24-7-0 roughly.

As stated above the area of the lands comes to 52 acres, leaving the [illegible] which are not fit for cultivation. For 52 acres therefore the [illegible] comes to Rs. 52 x Rs 24-/-0 = Rs 1248-12-0 [illegible] round figure therefore I fix the reasonable rent in the form of Rs. [illegible] [illegible]70/- [illegible] hundred and Seventy [illegible] remain in force [illegible] for a period of [illegible] years from the [illegible]

The opponent [illegible] stress on the fact that the lands are subject to ravages of stray cattle and so has to spend a sum of Rs 300/- for the purpose of keeping watchmen over the lands. But I cannot attach much importance to this contention because no [illegible] disadvantage there are [illegible] other cultivators [illegible] also. [illegible] the cost of cultivation would be less because the lands can be [illegible] in a very short time. It is [illegible] to keep a watch over the lands [illegible] intensive cultivation is possible with less efforts. So I cannot give importance to this contention of the opponent.

The parties should be informed of the order and necessary orders [illegible] be issued to [illegible] to keep a note in the R. of R.

[illegible]
[illegible]-[illegible]-1950

Sd/ [illegible]
Mamlatdar [illegible]

By Shrimanniranjan Chandrashekharswami of Gadag.

[illegible] 11-1-51 [illegible] 118 English
[illegible] 15-1-51 [illegible]
[illegible] 17-1-51 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
Sd/ 0-11-2
3-9